

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1861.

ART. I.—*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V. VI. London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand. 1860.

MR. FROUDE, in his earlier volumes, treated of the caprices of an imperious will, not perhaps creating, but certainly accelerating new forms of circumstances: in these later ones, his task is to describe the caprice of circumstances themselves carrying the nation and its rulers along with them. Henry imagined that still, after his death, might be maintained the same unnatural waiting of passions and intellectual moods upon the statesman's will, which had arisen in his lifetime from a peculiar constitution of things abroad and at home which no longer existed. In the body of executors named by him, the parties of reaction and progress were both represented, but with an elimination of names of men like Gardiner, so able and determined as to be likely to gain a decided predominance for their own views. He desired to leave the country politically Protestant, but doctrinally alternating between Rome and Geneva, at least till his successor should be old enough to carry belief on or back.

The brother of Jane Seymour, the Earl of Hertford, better known as Duke of Somerset, had at all events no authority from him to take upon himself sovereign power. That nobleman might have been excused had he by experience found it practically impossible to control a nation over which the anarchical tide of intellectual development or agitation was rushing, unless the sole power was committed to one hand; but, as it was, without giving himself or his colleagues any time to test the justice of such an anticipation, within a few minutes after the monarch's death, he was employed in trying to gain over Paget to concur in his usurpation of sovereign power. His vain ambition after no long time brought on its own punishment; and so entirely without pretext had been its exhibition, that no reader of the history of the Protectorate can feel pity for

Somerset to be a matter of right. Yet compassion for his fate will not be the less fully conceded on that account.

Mr. Froude himself, in his narrative of the period, seems to be influenced by this sort of inconsistency: his account of the Duke of Somerset's actions necessitates his condemnation; yet, along with the promulgation of the sentence, is ever an undercurrent of sympathy with the offender. A man of strong will is likely never to be judged impartially. If he be a sovereign the probability becomes almost certainty: his will is sure to have indented the age with a print to be traced through all the folds of intervening ages, and to have given his period an impulse either in accordance with his efforts, or displaying the energy of repulsion, which may still be felt. We now are influenced by the spirit of the constitution of which William III. was the hero, and of the modification of religious system fashioned by Henry VIII.; and English historians can accordingly never describe even the positive actions of these kings but as controversialists rather than as inquirers. In the history of Henry's reign the reader seems to be ever being challenged to opposition by the argumentative tone of the writer; and there is always lurking in his mind a suspicion, destructive of all hope of profit from the book, that, though the State papers cited have been accurately and truthfully sifted, an investigation commenced with a contrary prepossession might elicit precisely contrary results. But Somerset's character and fortunes are neutral ground; had he never existed the state of England would, by the reign of Elizabeth, have probably been much the same as it actually then was, and consequently no private prepossession in favour of his individual character involves a partisan view of the acts in which he was engaged. He is described as endued with some ability as a general, but of the smallest talents for statesmanship; of great ambition, but without either great genius or great energy to justify its excesses. In addition, his disposition, we are told, was amiable, his intentions often noble, and his misfortunes tragic. In short, his is just that kind of character which offers no temptation to the historian to eulogise unduly, and of which the weaknesses were so co-ordinate with, and relative to the virtues, and both to the man's fate, and actual position in history, that the tenderness of treatment which may be conceded to it is sure not to rouse a contrary prejudice.

In fact, Somerset may have had many splendid qualities, which would have ensured him an eminent rank in a king's court, in which he was not to be the chief administrator. It was his misfortune that, while the times required a much more masculine and inflexible spirit, his rank among Henry's executors had almost forced him to grasp at the supremacy which

the confusion of the times made it necessary to devolve upon one man, and which his recollection of the bold dogmatic way in which the late king had exercised his power induced him, with a title and abilities so conspicuously inferior, to attempt to use in the same despotic manner. Only mighty genius could have carried to a successful issue so audacious a *coup d'état* as that by which the Protector established his authority at the first, or saved from a disgraceful fall the vanity which led him to write to kings as an equal. His good fortune itself, at the commencement of his administration, as it tempted him to encroachments, so made his downfall the more humiliating. At first circumstances were most favourable in appearance. The Emperor Charles V. rejected the Pope's advice to claim the crown of England for his cousin Mary; and at home the chancellor Wriothesley, ever a fierce opponent, himself gave occasion for expulsion from his office, and, consequently, from the council. The relations with France alone were threatening, the Protector's new fortifications at Boulogne, and in Scotland, France's old ally, affording but too fair a pretext for hostilities. For domestic matters, no sooner was the Protector firmly established, than the violent reformers were permitted, and almost encouraged, to carry out their favourite innovations. In vain did Gardiner, who, Mr. Froude somewhat ungenerously intimates, only when in a minority understood the merits of moderation, entreated Somerset not 'to trouble the realm with novelties,' at least during Edward's minority; and taunted Ridley with railing at holy water and images with 'light rash eloquence.' The destructive propensity is always strong in men; it now, freed from the hard determination of the late sovereign, began to rage among the populace; it raged even in the Protector's heart. Painted glass and frescoes were destroyed by the order of the Government; and even bakers and brewers, smiths and shoemakers, were forbidden their special holy days. Well now might the proud noble think himself a worthy successor to the sway of Henry. Following that monarch's example, he was issuing ecclesiastical commissions, and curbing the pride of bishops; and this domestic campaign was close followed by a gigantic invasion of Scotland, headed by himself, and a triumphant return after the great victory of Pinkie Cleugh.

Nevertheless, a black cloud of discontent was rising over the whole country. There was much show of exactitude in small religious distinctions, but little of the reality; and men, like Latimer, foretold retribution for the desolating selfishness which had crept over all things. It might have been a shorter, or it might have been a longer interval, before the consequences of

this national malady affected the Protector; but, sooner or later, he was sure to be made the scapegoat, and not altogether unjustly. He had thrust himself into a position to which he had no natural right; and, when possessed of the virtual sovereignty, he ruled, with a vague theory of policy indeed in view, but no practical, industrious statesmanship in choosing means or instruments. Mr. Froude undoubtedly does not unfairly colour Somerset's acts, to extract therefrom a conclusion favourable for him; but he does appear to have a tenderness for him, which leads him unduly to exalt kindly instincts which, when so entirely undeveloped as in this case, are vices rather than virtues in statesmen. It is, indeed, hard, in reading accounts of wars with Scotland, acknowledged by the historian to have been without rational aim or result; of the usurpation of powers not delegated by any legitimate authority; of rash grasping at church-lands; tampering with the coinage, and the building of a sumptuous palace;—to discover much occasion for eulogy. The man's character, in short, does not appear so very different in essential particulars from that of the rapacious herd of courtiers. He did not delight in hanging 'sturdy valiant beggars;' but in his rivalries with other nobles, he was not more generous than they. Wriothesley, and the Protector's hapless brother, Lord Seymour, and Gardiner, found him relentless enough. Dudley himself, bad and unscrupulous as he was, may have been justified in his revenge by his victim's confession, that murderous projects had been, in fact, entertained by himself. Mr. Froude urges often the partisanship manifested by the duke in favour of the commonalty, and the expressions of his indignation against the covetous aristocracy. What he does not make so clear is, whether or no all this popular demeanour were not assumed by him from selfish ambition. When menaced by the council, he did not shrink from trying to provoke a sort of servile insurrection, or from strange threats, that he would involve his king in his own destruction. When fallen from power, and with the chieftainship of the Protestant party stolen from him by the Dudleys, he began to intrigue cautiously with Mary, and with the Conservative—even with the Catholic—party. One may pity his misfortunes; but he is hardly one who had a right to reproach his countrymen with ingratitude. Men worse—abundantly worse—than he there were; but neither in him—though with an attractive, popular easiness in his temperament, and capability of acquiescing with satisfaction in the happiness of others while he was himself in prosperity—does there seem to have been anything at all of the spirit of self-sacrifice. In the eyes of Mr. Froude, however, the fact of having held supreme power, unless it were attained by direct usurpation

from some one with a better legal right, furnishes always a strong presumption in a great man's favour. Resistance to such is a matter which it needs no laborious weight of evidence to prove to his satisfaction to be criminal. It is not so much an overweening love of authority which induces this conclusion, for this is scarcely the sort of disposition of which we should presuppose the existence in our historian; we believe it rather to be a dislike to the common, and often morbid propensity to lament over the downfall of men of a former age, in whose destruction, if we had been their contemporaries, we should in all probability have exulted. From this inclination to assail the accusations alleged against bygone State-prosecutions, it is but a short step to defend the prosecutors. The foolish tenderness, delighting in accusing the hardness of others, but with but a very shadowy connexion with active tenderness, which is wont to inveigh with the same harshness against the destruction of a Buckingham as of a Thomas More, and to assail first Somerset for slaying his brother, and then Dudley for putting Somerset to death, is the provocative of Mr. Froude's semi-latent partisanship. Because he finds superabundant evidence against Seymour and Dudley, he is tempted to claim a verdict in favour of the Protector, whereas he and his rivals were all alike guilty.

As one great error of these charming volumes, as of their predecessors, is their author's disposition for explaining the ill fortune of one man by the superior virtue of another, in opposition to the popular view of human events which represents all historical personages of old times as either victims or tyrants, so another defect is the tendency absolutely to interpret one part of a man's life by another. Thus the noble arguments and denunciations of Bishop Gardiner are not indeed suppressed, but accompanied ever by a running commentary, which, contrasting the pleas for moderation of the future Prime Minister of Queen Mary with his subsequent harshness to men whose views differed from his own, is meant apparently to induce in the reader a suspicion of insincerity on the part of the prelate. Gardiner's character is perhaps rather obscure to us: we can only guess out its phases. But when some aspects of a great man's career are culpable and others laudable, it is surely fairer to give due weight to both, than—which is at the same time the usual, and, in some measure, the natural result—to endeavour to account for the one as but the other in disguise. Political and religious opinions were at this period, as at many other epochs in English history, jumbled together inextricably. There were but few men who, like Sir T. More, could act uprightly and honestly at once in matters of politics and of religion,

not letting their views of the one be distorted by those of the other. Not such a statesman, not such a Christian, perhaps, was Gardiner; but, nevertheless, there was something generous and high-minded in his conceptions both of statesmanship and of religion. The student of history feels somewhat discouraged when he finds propounded as the exceptions to the profligacy of the times the cold sagacity of Paget and Cecil, and the headstrong vanity of Somerset, who was building sumptuous palaces while pretending to bemoan the sufferings of the poor whom the Church lands he grasped at so covetously might have effectually relieved; it is some consolation to mark that Gardiner, while refusing to purchase restoration to the council, where he must soon have been pre-eminent, by pledging his belief to what he thought wrong, yet bore, while in disgrace and in prison, to address frank, but not unfriendly advice and warnings to the ministers whose work his sufferings were. Gardiner was too much of a politician; he had been too thoroughly imbued with the experiences of Henry's sycophant Court to be a hero; but he was a thoughtful, and not unpatriotic Englishman, not disposed to thrust himself into martyrdom, but, at the same time, not ready to forfeit self-respect for the purpose of avoiding it. A certain length he was willing to be dragged, protesting all the way, but beyond that no threats and no punishments could force him. He proved a sagacious Minister under Henry VIII. Had he held the same relative position in Protestant views that he did in Catholic ones, and flourished in Elizabeth's reign, he would probably have gained a reputation even exceeding that of Cecil. It was his evil fate to have endured oppressions to a great degree quite unjustifiable and unprovoked at the hands of Edward's Protestant advisers, and then to have regained power at the moment of Catholic reaction. He was a Conservative, though not naturally a bigoted one, with a keen feeling of the ludicrous and absurd in enthusiasm; and the scenes of misery and national disgrace, the fruits of an intemperate spirit of innovation in the reign of Edward, had produced their result in his deliberate, unimpassioned assent to the impassioned determination of the succeeding sovereign to restore, at all events, the old state of things.

We have less difficulty in subscribing to Mr. Froude's praise of Paget than to his depreciation of Bishop Gardiner. Sir William Paget is manifestly one of his favourites. He was a clear-sighted, keen minister, and, with that great virtue in the historian's eyes, the habit, partly the result of temperament, and partly of circumstances, of going, not from sordid obsequiousness, but with his own free and candid assent, with the tide. It was by his help, though not at his instigation, that Somerset

assumed the Protectorate; it was with his consent, and in consequence of continued disobedience to his wise injunctions, that that noble was deposed from his pre-eminence, Honours and wealth rather came to, than were solicited by him; and even the foes of his policy, like Seymour, had opportunities of profiting by his prudent and kindly counsels. When danger came, he was ever ready to offer advice, the best under the circumstances; he never intrigued to secure himself when his immediate friends fell; and he escaped persecution—except during the period of Dudley's sway—because there was never anything in his character, and therefore in his conduct, to provoke it. Perhaps there is no statesman so conspicuously respectable in the reigns of the Tudors as Paget; he saw so clearly into men's characters, he judged so wisely of circumstances; but, at the same time, there is nothing in him to challenge vehement admiration, or inspire affection. His functions were those of a Greek chorus, chameleon-like, through whose moods and aspects the features and colours of the surrounding scene are shadowed out.

Mr. Froude's representation of the rest of the statesmen of the time we believe a just one. They were, with scarcely an exception, of the courtier type which had succeeded to effete feudalism. One cares but little for the fate of men like Lord Seymour of Sudleye, whose only excellence was courage. Yet the numerous vices of such personages as these do not excuse the illegal measures taken by their political rivals against them. Still less do they excuse a defence for their perpetrators, like that quoted with approbation by Mr. Froude from one of Bishop Latimer's sermons. There the preacher, 'assuredly,' the historian is justified in exclaiming, 'no sycophant of Government,' yet perhaps not therefore the less disposed to treat of the rules of law as unjust clogs on the exertion of force against those whose existence he believed pernicious to the Commonwealth, stoutly asserts that it was equitable and proper to refuse the accused a trial, justifying his doctrine rather oddly by pointing to the instance of S. Paul, who, by being (when accused) allowed to answer for himself at Jerusalem, got nearly torn in pieces, and then, applying his example to the case of Somerset, who was, as it were, plaintiff against Seymour, to whom the right of self-defence was denied: 'When S. Paul was saved by the magistrate, being but a private man, will ye not allow that something may be done for saving of the magistrate's life?'

The discontent of the country corresponded to the selfishness at the basis of all the intrigues and counter-intrigues of the rulers. There could be no respect for authority when it was seen that authority was used merely to protect dishonesty and covetousness. The consciousness of the national misfortunes

being traceable to their body made the council full of discontent. The Protector had arrogated power kingly all but in name, and it was natural that his colleagues should impute to him the general disorder. The rabble pretending to be reformers in the towns, the peasants breaking down inclosures in the country; all alike affected, and not without some reason, to have been encouraged in their movements by him. These agrarian riots, or insurrections, are well described by Mr. Froude; he possesses, like Lord Macaulay, the art of describing, not only the marches and assaults of troops, but those in relation to the natural features of the country in which they took place. It is, certainly, a pleasant surprise to come, with reminiscences of Hume's lifeless narrative full upon one, upon a spirit-stirring story, not the less true, and much the more instructive, because so picturesque, of these scenes of anarchy—a gladder spectacle, perhaps, to men who, like Mr. Froude, see, and see truly, the English spirit alive in England at all periods of its history, than would have been that of a country as ready as a court to bend to every turn of a ruler's caprice. We may think the peasants of Devonshire and those of Norfolk wrong, and equally so in their various objects; but they, at least, fought for what they thought of public benefit, and did not intrigue for mere objects of self-interest. In his narrative we see the priest of Samford Courtenay, saying mass in Latin, the common people all the country round clapping their hands for joy; the blazing barns of Crediton, with the bold churls behind them defying the scornful Carews; Walter Raleigh, father of the hero of Elizabeth's reign, chiding at the old woman telling her beads, and her screaming in the church to the frenzied villagers, 'Ye must leave beads and holy water now, or the gentlemen will burn your houses over your heads;' the Carews probing the mud of the river at Clyst, to find footing that they might dash through at the rioters, and then the rising of the whole of the West in rage and despair, and gentlemen hiding for their lives in woods and caves. Next we have an interlude of the stern insolent Bonner being bidden by the council to prove that the rebels of the West were, by their acts, 'incurring damnation ever to be in the burning fire of hell with Lucifer, the father and first author of disobedience;' the tale of Oxfordshire rectors dangling from their church towers for presuming to refuse assent to the theses of Peter Martyr, and of strange altercations in the Council Chamber between the incapable Protector and his contemptuous advisers. Then the narrative of the rebellion is resumed with the siege of Exeter, where right gallantly the aldermen held the town against the rioters, whose demands they sympathized with, in the interests of general order, with the rash onslaught, as usual, of the Carews

at the barricade in Fennington meadows, and the culminating of the conflict at S. Mary's, Clyst. Mr. Froude is himself carried away by the spirit of his own description, and speaks of the armed insurgents against a lawful government as having the better cause; or, perhaps, his partiality for them is but as a consequence of what appears to be the fundamental conception of his history, viz. that there is an *à priori* probability in favour of the equitableness of the acts of the majority. As this theory would lead him to defend the condemnation of an Anne Boleyn by Parliament, an individual by a multitude, so it would induce in him a presumption, only less vehement, that the rising of whole counties argued (as, indeed, we believe most entirely it did) gross errors on the part of the rulers. A stormy struggle and bloody massacre on the evening of the 3d of August, took place on the heath by Topsham: 'Among the peasantry the irritation was justly turned to madness, when they knew that foreign mercenaries (viz. German lanzknechts and Italian musketeers) were brought in to crush them. Never before had English rulers used the arms of strangers against English subjects; and no sooner were their columns in sight than the villagers of Clyst rushed up in rage to fall upon them. One could wish that the better cause had found the better defenders. The half-armed Devonshire peasants were poorly matched against trained and disciplined troops. Few who went up the hill came back again; they fell in the summer gloaming, like stout-hearted, valiant men, for their hearths and altars; and Miles Coverdale, translator of the Bible, and future Bishop of Exeter, preached a thanksgiving sermon among their bodies, as they lay with stiffening limbs with their faces to the stars.' But the work was not yet done: the rebels were swarming all the night through thick into Clyst, and, six thousand strong, drew up on the village green, and lined the houses and neighbouring furze brake. At length the Italian muskets gave the victory to Russell and the regular forces, and the red dragon floated on the walls of starving Exeter. On Sunday, the 17th of August, the insurgents received their final defeat, and then so-called justice occupied the scene. It is, no doubt, likely, as Mr. Froude says, that, had the reports of Sir Arthur Kingston, who was sent as Provost-Marshal into Cornwall, survived, the account would have been different to the gloomy traditions current in the next generation of the sort of law dealt out to that country; but we fear that Sir Arthur's friendship for Bishop Hooper, which is urged by the historian as a presumption in his favour, can scarcely disprove the allegations of curt equity applied by him in the case of Catholic recusants. There is certainly intrinsic evidence of veracity in the rough

Colonel-Kirke-like humour shown in the two stories told to exemplify his method of procedure. A miller, who had been out with the insurgents, expecting inquiry, had persuaded a servant to personate him. "Are you the miller?" said Kingston, riding 'one day to his door. "If you please, yes," was the unsuspecting answer. "Up with him," said the Provost-Marshal. "He is a busy knave, hang him up!" In vain the poor man called out then 'that he was no miller, but an innocent servant. "Thou art a false knave, then," said Sir Anthony, "to be in two tales; therefore hang him;" and he was hanged incontinently.' The second story is of the Mayor of Bodmin, who was confidently expecting pardon through his friends' intercession, when he received a message from the Provost-Marshal that he was to entertain him at dinner. 'He had a man to hang, too,' he said, and a stout gallows must be ready. The dinner was duly eaten, and the gallows prepared. 'Think you,' said Kingston, as they stood looking at it; 'think you it is strong enough?' 'Yea, sir,' quoth the mayor, 'it is.' 'Well then,' said Sir Anthony, 'get you up, for it is for you.' And the mayor, 'greatly abashed,' had to comply, and get hanged. After these two merry acts of Sir Anthony we fear the reader will require more evidence than an acquaintance with Hooper to make him assent to the conclusion that this cold-blooded jester was, 'in some respects, a noble sort of person.'

During part of the time during which the West had been disturbed on account especially of the change in religion, the general fashion of turning arable land into sheep-farms had excited the rising at the Oak of Reformation at Wymondham, under Ket the tanner. Contemporaneously also with the final suppression of the Devonshire insurrection, the Norfolk rioters were dispersed by Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and subsequently Duke of Northumberland. The Western tumults had been provoked by changes brought about by the direct authority of the Protector; in the Eastern the demands of the peasants were at least sympathised with by him; but in neither case did he care to spoil his popularity with the multitude by taking the lead frankly and openly in restoring public order. No monarch could have been more zealous of the invasion of his prerogatives; yet he left it to others to incur the odium of performing the duties of head of the executive. The disasters in the Boullonnais filled up the measure of his fellow-councillors' discontent; the gallantry of Dudley at Norwich had now given the crowd of disaffected statesmen a chief who is one of the most remarkable personages in English history.

Mr. Froude, in his half-eulogistic blame of Somerset for his good intentions, which were 'so many that he was betrayed by

'their very number,' 'his moderate ability and immoderate ambition to do good,' and his desire to restore the golden age, seems to us to have outstripped the facts, without however suppressing any. From his own narrative we are at a loss to discover how much can be said even for the theories of a statesman who is acknowledged in prosperity to have affected state which did not belong to him, and in misfortunes to have been passionate and unmanageable, whilst, amid the ruin of the national finances, he had succeeded in amassing an immense fortune. When his rivals were the lords whose enclosures had excited the popular wrath, it is hard, in the absence of all less dubious signs of active interest in the popular welfare, to recognise much magnanimity in wordy upbraidings of colleagues who at least were ready to support *their* theories of government at their own personal and pecuniary risk. Not a single proof from deeds has been brought forward by Mr. Froude in aid of his description of the Protector's weakness as at all events *magnificent*. Mr. Froude has a decided prejudice in favour of Somerset and against his successor, Dudley; and these two feelings seem to have been exaggerated in his mind by mutual action and reaction. Dudley he portrays as unenthusiastic, silent, cunning, and plausible, with 'a tone of studied moderation, a seeming disinterestedness, a thoughtful anxiety for others. With something of the reality, something of the affectation of high qualities, with great personal courage, and a coolness which never allowed him to be off his guard, he had a character well fitted to impose on others, because, first of all, it is likely that he had imposed on himself.' In considering this character, we are beset with the same shadow of suspicion which haunts the whole of this certainly very remarkable contribution to English history. Mr. Froude is always endeavouring to clear up incongruities in character and in facts; he does not make enough account of the natural inconsistencies, often all but contradictory, in men and circumstances, still less of the power of development of one quality, forced into undue maturity by circumstances, so as gradually to coop up or drive out other and nobler ones. Because at a future time, when spoiled by the temptations of ambition, he showed but scant consideration for his contemporaries, we are not to suppose that his petition that the luckless Northampton might be continued in command over him was but *seemingly* disinterested, any more than that his courage in Norfolk, when he pledged his companions by kissing their swords that he would either conquer or die, was *unreal*, because, in the face of a whole nation in arms against him, he made no very heroic stand against the advance of Mary. Even the two acts on which his condemnation by historians is generally based—the execution of

Somerset, and the elevation of Jane Grey to the throne—may not be so very black as they are often accounted by persons who begin with a preconception of the character of him the chief actor in those matters as profoundly bad. For the first charge, Mr. Froude allows that Palmer's evidence, and, unless the young King were himself deceived, the confession (which Mr. Froude assumes, we know not on what authority, to have been before the Peers) of Somerset himself, and, subsequently, of Bertiville, who declared he had been hired to murder Dudley, go far to prove that the Duke suffered rightfully. But it is strange to observe the two-edged form in which the historian expresses his condemnation of the king's uncle: 'If it be true that Somerset confessed, either in the court or the Tower, that he had really meditated murder, he was no better than Northumberland (Dudley's new title); interest or sympathy is alike wasted upon either.' Why, if the accused were truly found guilty of such an attempt, should the rival, who had averted the blow, be compromised by having stood on his defence successfully against so foul a conspiracy? The fact, if it be a fact, that Northumberland confessed, before his own death, that through his means Somerset had been falsely accused, may perplex us in the teeth of the latter duke's contradictory confession that he had not been falsely accused; but, at least, the two incongruities should be set against each other: with no more easily reconcilable fragments of evidence it is inequitable to condemn Dudley on this point. In respect of the usurpation of the crown by Lady Jane Grey, which was unquestionably his work, there need be no contest about facts. But, when the stern persistency by Mary, most honourable as it was, in adhering to her mother's faith, is considered, and all the features of that character, whence flowed acts which made obedience to Rome ever after an impossibility in England, some plea, even on the merits of the case, may be discovered for the project. It is hardly justifiable to appeal to a plot, as positive proof of the mean utter selfishness of its author, when the direct object of that plot—and effectually, had it been successful, it would have accomplished this end—was not so much to cause as to prevent a revolution, to keep, that is, the same spirit, which, bad or good, had predominated in Edward's councils, prevalent in England. It is equally unwarrantable to argue, that, 'If the Reformation had been, as he pretended, his true concern, Dudley would have brought back Mary himself bound by conditions which in her danger she would have accepted.' What security would there have been in such engagements!

Mr. Froude's fifth volume ends with the death of Edward, the most exalted in rank of all the personages described in the

history, but of whom there are naturally but rare glimpses discernible in the narrative ; it is, perhaps, a proof of the extraordinary precocity of the young prince, that he occupies any position whatever at so early an age. Mr. Froude, though anxious to apologize for any seeming harshness in passages quoted from his letters and diary, as in relation to the death of Somerset, gives a picture of him not very different from that which other historians have presented. He would probably have made a good sovereign, careful for his subjects' welfare, but probably, also, with a narrow-minded obstinacy in adhering to his own views, the harsher, because conscientious. But the two chief figures in the narrative are Somerset and Northumberland ; and it is, perhaps, on that account that the reader leaves off, charmed, indeed, but with a not sufficiently definite idea of the period. The fault of the style of writing history fashionable in the last century is, that high politics, the marches of armies, and embassies, diversified, perhaps, with a debate in Parliament, take up the whole. Yet the reader has at the end in his mind a conception of the reign described. It is not a very full one, but the outline is clear ; the outline, perhaps, is not very correct, but it is, at all events, definite. After perusing Mr. Froude's much more graphic pages, we fancy we know the time exactly ; we have gathered so many minute particulars about individuals, we can so vividly picture to ourselves the scenes and peculiarities of an insurrection. But it is as hard to collect a general view out of these details, as it will be for future historians to compile a history of the reign of Victoria from the files of the *Times* ; the materials are here in abundance : but something of the labour and genius of a historian is needed to fuse the details, and make history out of a gazette. But, as we suggested above, the want of a central figure, the plenteousness of factions, the anarchical state in which the whole national mind was, may, perhaps, explain this felt want in a manner less derogatory to the author. Certainly it is far less, if at all, perceptible in the following volume, where the deeply-marked characters of Mary and Philip, Pole and Gardiner, and of their policy and principles of government, leave no room for doubt as to the conception of the age, and its place in the history of the world.

The epoch ushered in by blood-red hail, and the fall of church steeples was, indeed, one of a sufficiently marked character, as marked as the difference between the characters of Edward's two rival successors. There is certainly no sweeter and purer character in English history than Lady Jane Grey ; and Mr. Froude does entire justice to her piety, purity, and free, noble innocence. Virtues uncoloured, as he adds, 'even

'to a fault, with the emotional weaknesses of humanity,' do not, perhaps, excite in him as much interest as the at least sufficiently passion-tinted excellencies of Henry VIII., or the defective organization of his strange daughters; but this is not a peculiarity of Mr. Froude's: every student of the period feels the tale of Lady Jane Grey's early virtues and early calamities merely an episode, as beautiful, or more so than that of Nisus and Euryalus, or Camilla, or Pallas, in Virgil, but yet somewhat beside the real substance of the period, and the omission of which would spoil the harmony, but not the form of our history. It is, however, an episode which throws into fine relief the brief dark reign which followed. The ghastly pale face of the young, all but dead king, watching the crowd from the palace-window at Greenwich; the ill-dissembled scorn and wrath of the council compelled to sign a manifesto they thoroughly disbelieved, at the insolent dictation of the now desperate Northumberland; the courier spurring through the night to warn Mary at Hunsdon, her bold flight and arming; the vehement, even 'shrieking,' denunciation of her cause by Ridley at Paul's Cross, or Sandys' quiet saunter in the meadows of the Cam, with his hooting and hustling by the gowned rabble in the senate-house, in theory always so calm; and the self-condemnatory pusillanimity of Northumberland, as, with 'one clutch at his beard,' he threw up his cap, and shouted for Queen Mary, with the loud-voiced enthusiasm of a whole nation in the cause of the legitimate heir—form a grand archway by which to enter on a reign, not degrading to our national character, but as black and tragic as any epoch in our annals.

Mr. Froude dwells much, and rightly so, on the character of Mary, as, in fact, he ever does on the qualities and habits of mind, even on the less essential traits of the great personages in history. In these volumes he asserts that he believes individual character does exert a very great, and sometimes a permanent influence upon a people's fortunes, though, perhaps, great revolutions in opinion may be the effect of commensurately extensive and general changes in circumstances. His tone is moderate, but we should judge, from internal evidence, that his bias is as much in direction of the one extreme, as Mr. Buckle's is in that of the other. It appears to us that it is wrong either to exclude the consideration of individual character, or to consider it solely in tracing the causes of events; it must always, if there be individuals with characters sufficiently marked, be one of the aggregate phenomena which together constitute the cause. If, for instance, the general tone of thought and feeling be not gravitating very decidedly in any particular direction, the throwing into the one scale the

energy and uncompromising resoluteness of one man's character may produce an impetus which may tend to reproduce itself. Otherwise, however decided the movement in that one direction, it will scarcely be strong enough to outlast the continuous resistance in the other, unless, from the accident, if we may so speak, of individual character anew and independently coming in before the results of the previous effort have subsided, and giving a fresh momentum. Had Elizabeth held the same opinions as her sister, these two reigns, succeeded by those of the Stuarts, might have produced in England the same sort of Catholicism, by no means Ultramontane, as was later established in the Gallican Church, and which was probably the ideal vaguely floating before the eyes of Henry VIII. But such an effect could in no wise have resulted from the short, single reign of Mary. Apart from other considerations, her character, as portrayed in the sixth volume of this history, furnishes a complete explanation of the violent repulsion which ensued from her policy. During misfortune, Mary could display a bearing almost heroic. Her patient but firm persistency in refusing to conform, even outwardly, to Protestantism, contrasts favourably with the terrible pliability of faith among the courtiers of that age, and with the less rigid adherence to her opinions of Elizabeth herself. No one could have displayed a more royal demeanour than did she when a pretender aspired to usurp her rights, and her proud determination to act in accordance both with her rights and her duty brought twenty thousand armed men to her side from a jealous city in the crisis of a rebellion. When, too, her own interests alone were concerned, she knew how to temper justice with mercy. Even Northumberland she was inclined to pardon; and, except in the solitary instance of her sister, never showed anything savouring of vindictiveness. But many noble qualities were in her tainted and spoiled by an unbending obstinacy. Proudly had she preserved her independence of thought during her father's and brother's reigns, and yet without intriguing against the royal authority. She thus came to the throne with a full belief in the truth of those principles which had, she believed, conducted her to supremacy, and with the determination to require of others the same obedience which she had paid except in matters of religion, which, by a natural inconsistency, she no longer remembered to distinguish from the things in which obedience may be demanded. The nation would probably have willingly reverted to the point in belief and Church discipline where Henry had left them, but while Mary's disposition to bow the country beneath the Papal authority disgusted the people, the aristocracy were suspicious as to her intentions with respect to the old possessions of the

Church. This feeling, and the popular aversion to the Spanish marriage, were manifest enough to the queen; but, as she had never swerved from her principles to save herself from the menaces of Edward's ministers, so was she resolved upon maintaining her freedom and her plans as sovereign. With all this obstinacy, or rigidity of purpose (it was both), we find in Mr. Froude's sixth volume evidences of a curiously feminine weakness observable, indeed, but better concealed in Elizabeth's character, which contrasts conspicuously with her many masculine qualities. There is, perhaps, exaggeration, but not too much to mar the essential truthfulness of the picture, in Mr. Froude's commentary on that long-deferred and anxiously yearned-for meeting with her Spanish husband. The historian describes the prince's nervous and sharp glances round him on landing, warning us, however, that for these touches he has no authority; the stiff demeanour, the cruel rain and howling wind which followed his progress to Winchester, his instant visit, with drenched scarlet cloak and draggled plume, to the cathedral, and the strains of the *Te Deum*, prolonged till the long aisles grew dim in the summer twilight. 'Philip,' he proceeds, partly relying on facts, partly conjecturally, 'doubtless could have endured the postponement of an interview till morning; but Mary could not wait, and the same night he was conducted into the presence of his haggard bride, who now, after a life of misery, believed herself at the open gate of Paradise. Let the curtain fall over the meeting; let it close also over the wedding solemnities which followed, with due splendour, two days later. There are scenes in life which we regard with pity too deep for words. The unhappy queen, unloved, unloveable, yet with her parched heart thirsting for affection, was flinging herself upon a breast to which an iceberg was warm; upon a man to whom love was an unmeaning word, except as the most brutal of passions. For a few months she created for herself an atmosphere of unreality. She saw in Philip the ideal of her imagination, and in Philip's feelings the reflex of her own; but the dream passed away—her love for her husband remained; but remained only to be a torture to her. With a broken spirit and bewildered understanding, she turned to Heaven for comfort, and, instead of Heaven, she saw only the false roof of her creed painted to imitate and shut out the sky.' To comprehend fully her infatuation, we must remember the long persecution endured by Mary, before and after her mother's death, on account of the Spanish connexion; we must remember how she must have ever turned to Spain as her refuge and hope. To her imagination, a marriage with the Prince of Spain was an alliance, not only with the temporal head of her faith, but

with
fath
we
in w
in th
H
rebe
the
term
mean
was
daun
has
tells
love,
the l
tion
voice
she
her
have
cowe
and
their
clam
lette
bidd
their
'dar
'cut
'mo
'Lo
forlo
T
to C
ming
and
the
betr
Ran
part
as a
abho
egot
men
in th
Ne

with the only family which her repudiation in some sort by her father allowed her to think her own. This consideration ought, we believe, to have checked the contemptuousness, and the tone in which her love is glanced at as baseless and raving, apparent in the otherwise fine description just quoted.

Her better qualities were more conspicuous before Wyatt's rebellion. That embittered her mind against her sister and the Protestant party, with whom she had previously kept terms. But it was only when the victory was won that her meaner nature showed itself: in suppressing it, and while she was yet encompassed with dangers, she was every whit the dauntless daughter of Henry VIII. and Catherine. Mr. Froude has an especial talent for describing an insurrection. He well tells us how the Queen, without troops, money, or her subjects' love, rode with a 'studied' (though why *studied*, when all the horizon was black with clouds, we cannot say) air of dejection to the Guildhall, and there—as, with her deep, man's voice, she reminded her half-pitying, half-hostile audience, that she stood among them lawful Queen of England—won to her cause the swords of five-and-twenty thousand men. We have a fine picture of the rebel leaders: the Duke of Suffolk cowering in the hollow of an old tree in his own park at Astley, and his son buried under bundles of hay, on the one side; with their fellow-plotter, Wyatt, on the other, replying to the proclamation of a reward for his head by wearing his name in broad letters on his cap; or scaling the gatehouse of London Bridge, bidding the porter and his wife, whom he caught nodding over their fire, 'on their lives be still, and stealing along in the 'darkness to the chasm, from which the drawbridge had been 'cut away, and looking beyond the black gulf between the dusky 'mouths of four gaping cannon; and seeing, in the torch-light, 'Lord Howard keeping watch beside them,' or leading his forlorn hope gallantly through the whole great town.

Towards Mary Mr. Froude is not, in sentiment, unjust; but to Cardinal Pole he is quite intolerant. He has kind words, mingled with his censure, for the rebel peasants of Devon, and for Protector Somerset, for the insubordinate Hooper, and the bigotry of Edward and of Mary; but for the Cardinal he betrays everywhere an angry contempt. The theologian, whom Ranke speaks of with respect as a great leader of the reforming party in the Catholic Church, is regarded in these pages simply as a petulant, unreasonable fanatic, hunting after vain unrealities abhorrent to all sound minds, and a prey, moreover, to a tyrannic egotism. He feels no indulgence for the recoil of disappointment, which would naturally arise at having his recall delayed, in the heart of a man so long an exile, who had never, in the

splendour of his ecclesiastical rank, forgotten that he was an Englishman, and yet who repulsed negotiations which might have gained him a matrimonial crown in his native country. We cannot understand why, when at length permission was brought to the enthusiastic legate to return home, he should be sneered at as about to have 'his eager temperament for ever 'excited either with wild hopes, or equally wild despondency, 'now fooled to the top of its bent.' The Cardinal's mission was certainly not for the good of England; but its gravity and importance were sufficiently great to make his joy at the licence at last to enter the effect of no vain delusion. Fortunately for his readers, dislike does not mar Mr. Froude's power of description; and it is assuredly all put forth in the narrative of Pole's reconciliation of England to Rome, and the accompanying circumstances. He mentions, but without wasting time in praising it, the Cardinal's magnanimous carelessness about his own interests, and absorbing care for those of his Church, and intimates, somewhat gratuitously, that the popular welcome given to him was not to the papal legate, but the English nobleman. Then the eager catching of the anxious queen at any encouragement for her hopes of offspring, and the equally eager, but not therefore, as the historian seems to think, ridiculous ardour of hope in the returned exile, are well painted; and, still more, the final scene, when, on Saint Andrew's-day, in the dull November afternoon, before the English Parliament and the highest nobles of Spain and Flanders, Queen and King kneeling before the representative of Rome, 'in dead silence across the dimly-lighted hall, while, amidst the hushed breathing, every tone 'was audible, and at the pauses were heard the smothered sobs 'of the Queen, came the low, awful words of the absolution.'

On whom the guilt of the persecution which has made the later years of Mary's reign a byword directly lies, seems doubtful. On Bonner, by a sort of common consent, the odium of the grosser forms of cruelty has been thrown. He had not shrunk from bearing persecution himself well, though not heroically; and his rough, fierce nature, though with an occasionally glancing under-current of good nature, which, in Mr. Froude's account of him, brings to mind Judge Jeffreys, has gained for himself and his famous Coalhouse a very unenviable place in other than children's histories of England. It has not been so readily agreed who were the more statesmanlike and responsible agents in the matter. Mr. Froude considers that the crime of setting the persecution on foot rests with Gardiner, — 'vindictive, ruthless, treacherous, though in courage indomitable.' It does, in truth, appear that the illegal treatment to which the Bishop of Winchester had been subjected in the last

reign, had infused into his rather cold nature a yet more complete conviction than that felt by him in Henry's reign, that innovation ought to be, and could be, put down by force. But, as it is observed by Mr. Froude, Gardiner died; but the policy, which the multitude attributed to him as the Queen's prime minister, was still persevered in; and the historian's conclusion therefore is, not simply that it could not have been the work of that individual politician, but that it must have proceeded from some other of the sovereign's advisers. Himself he exonerates to a great degree: 'Those forlorn hours, when Mary would sit on the ground with her knees drawn to her face; those restless days and nights when, like a ghost, she would wander about the palace galleries, rousing herself only to write tear-blotted letters to her husband; those bursts of fury over the libels dropped in her way; or the marching in procession behind the Host in the London streets: these are all the signs of hysterical derangement, and leave little room for other feelings than pity.' To whom, then, does the charge attach of having guided and hurried on those blind passions and hopes of arousing Heaven's compassion by human sacrifices? To whom did the presiding geniuses of Lollard's Tower and Bonner's Coalhouse look for countenance? At whose door lies the death of Ridley and Latimer, and the sadder shifting to and fro of Cranmer? These were not, we are told, the fruit of Philip's bigotry; the brave Lords of the Council—those outspoken Protestants of Somerset's and Northumberland's train—so long as they could keep the ecclesiastical spoils, would not resist Catholicism; but they did not love it enough to make themselves hateful for its promotion; Bonner was but a tool, who even at times loathed his cruel office; Gardiner himself did not give the sign for the outbreak of fury, till an influence from the Flemish coast seduced him into violence. Pole, then, the historian believes, was the black spirit who, whether in the Netherlands or at Lambeth, ever led the van of the intolerant. It is startling to hear of the subtle intellect and strong sense of Gardiner having been wrought upon so strangely, by the weak enthusiast described by Mr. Froude under the name of Cardinal Pole. It is as surprising to have the mad dreamer taunted for the cowardly caution with which 'he passed by an earl and baron to take the lame, the halt, and the blind, the weaver from his loom, the carpenter from his workshop.' It surely must have escaped Mr. Froude, when he wrote this, that he had spoken of the influence of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, three of the Cardinal's alleged victims, as so great, that fears of a fierce popular outbreak had retarded their trial till Philip could get clear of the English

coasts. To Pole is referred the condemnation of strings of prisoners brought in from the lanes and byways; and he ridicules the appeal to him for justice by Ferrars of S. David's. This prelate, after being imprisoned in the last reign because 'his talk was chiefly of baking and brewing,' and for such unepiscopal habits as his 'daily using whistling to his child,' and also to the seals on the rocks at Milford Haven, was now sentenced, for grave theological dogmas, in which he does not seem to have taken much more interest than another 'masculine Christian,' a great friend of Mr. Froude's, who was hanged after the Devonshire rebellion, from his own church-steeple, in full canonicals, the deer-poaching priest of Samford Courtenay, 'who gave not his head for the polling, nor his beard for the washing.' 'Ferrars,' says the historian, 'appealed to the legate; but the legate never listened 'to the prayer of heretics: his mission was to extirpate them.' In vain have preceding historians urged that Pole sometimes lifted up his voice for merciful measures: as when, on the 20th of August, 1556, he delivered from Bonner's grasp a file of three-and-twenty prisoners, led in a string in from Colchester. This, argues the historian, was done only from fear of the popular rage—a likely motive, forsooth, to have influenced so wild a mind as he imputes to Pole. In vain might be urged the unanimous protest of the Council to the jealous Pope Paul IV., against the revocation of the legate's commission: this, it seems, was but sycophancy to the Queen. In vain the fact that the Canterbury tragedies are traceable to Archdeacon Harpfield, who had the superintendence of the diocese till Cranmer's death. The archdeacon, it is said, was but the tool, as though the superior, though, it is to be confessed, legally liable, is always morally so for the harshness of a subordinate. Even his virtues are brought up against him: his character is described as irreproachable; his acts as not the effect of a cruel nature, but of a belief that a denial of Roman Catholic tenets and of the papal supremacy was the greatest crime in the catalogue of sins, and that he was the chosen instrument to check these wickednesses. His virtues, it is declared, sprang from the same stock with the defects in his nature; human instincts and genial emotions had been extinguished in him, though not his enormous vanity; and enthusiasm had usurped the place of understanding, till he was become what seems to be, in Mr. Froude's eyes, the most destructive of characters, 'the man of an idea.' Such is hardly the view which would be taken of Cardinal Pole by one who had not the phenomena of the Marian persecution to explain. It is to no professional persecutor that the words of Ranke, surely a temperate and competent judge, refer: 'This 'legate was Reginald Pole, acceptable equally to the Queen,

'the nobles, and the people; moderate, intelligent, and raised far above all suspicion of sordid or unworthy purposes;' or, again, those of Pope Pius IV.: 'England we might have retained with perfect ease had Cardinal Pole been supported (by Rome) in his measures.' Some evidence might be afforded even by the fact of the cancelling of his legatine powers by the great patron of the Inquisition, Paul IV.—a persecutor, such as Mr. Froude has imagined Pole to have been, would have been admired by the fierce Caraffa. But Mr. Froude loves to have a central figure upon whom to concentrate his loathing of the idea of a bad age, as Dudley was his ideal of the bad spirit which ruled in the latter days of Edward VI. Bonner was too uncouth and material for the purpose, Philip too used up a type of persecutors, and Gardiner over much of a politician: in Pole he discovers a pure, uncalculating spontaneity of persecuting, and delights to find this united with his hated 'true Ultramontaniam, then and for the last time dominant in England.'

Mr. Froude's fault is in looking for an individual author of these horrors when a party was in fault. In the days of Edward the extreme Protestants had committed not a few enormities. In the days of Mary the extreme Catholics exacted a still more violent vengeance. They had certainly ringleaders; Bonner may have been one; they had been set in motion by feeling the reins by which they had been checked loosening in the hands of some eminent statesman; perhaps this must rest on Gardiner. But it is most undoubtedly perfectly gratuitous to attempt to trace a guiding influence throughout the whole duration of this storm: the impetus lasted till it had exhausted itself: it did not need, when once stirred, the promptings of a man like Pole; and of all men Pole's nature, we should fancy, was the least likely to mix itself in the coarse, material, unvisionary hopes of converting a realm in Smithfield. That he did not lift up his eloquent voice against the blind fury of his party is a charge, heavy we allow, which he must bear. But his crime is negative, not positive; he did not check the crowd, only because he never felt himself of it. What was his own business he believed he understood and could do; he left others to do their part in their own way.

The reign of Mary began in doubt and confusion; but all the perils and hazards which heralded her accession were for her glory. Never did a sovereign ascend a throne with a more apparent summons to her to mount it from the great majority of her subjects than Mary I. Never was a demise of the Crown welcomed with more general satisfaction. Her brave endurance of frowns of authority during the reigns of Henry and Edward; the gallant dash for the Crown, which was her right, on the

latter's death ; her dauntless bearing throughout Wyatt's insurrection, should have been followed by other consequences than the degradation of having kindled a persecution, and lost the last English possession in France.

We shall gladly hail two fresh volumes from Mr. Froude's pen. So long as he cares to extract such glowing narratives and such pregnant *précis* of character from tedious State papers he will never be without readers, whether partizans of the positivist or of the individualizing theory of history. But we hardly think that it would be much for the benefit of historical study if the style of historical composition represented by these volumes were to supersede that of which Hallam may be taken as an example. There is certainly no reason in the nature of things why the most brilliant narratives of events should not be attended by the calmest judicial commentary on them ; but the two qualities of historical composition require two different sets of intellectual qualities which are not very likely to meet in the same writer. Till the combination do come to pass we must look to other histories than those of this model for the philosophy of history. The distinctions and the relations between two ages and their essential characteristics, can never be learnt out of State papers taken singly, or from the characters of individual men however acutely sifted. These are but the materials from which the conclusion is to be got by careful induction and deduction. It is not enough to offer to the student the particulars, however abundant. Those he must certainly have ; but he should also have the historian's own view propounded as collected from the whole mass of details examined, with the reasons on which it is based. Much must be taken on faith ; it is impossible to give all the facts upon which the general conception was founded ; only some can be furnished to suggest the nature of those not produced ; it is altogether idle to bring forward a few scattered sayings or doings as proofs that such or such was the fact, when it may be that there are hundreds still not alleged which would go far to demonstrate the opposite conclusion.

ART. II.—*Memoir of Joshua Watson.* Edited by EDWARD CHURTON, Archdeacon of Cleveland. 2 Vols. London: J. and H. Parker.

THE present volumes may more strictly be regarded as a commemoration of worthies, a record of a band of brothers all acting together, all thinking the same thing, and working might and main in the same cause, than as the memoir of an individual. They constitute, in fact, a memorial of the opinions and doings of the leaders of the orthodox party, previous to the rise of the Oxford school, as it has been called, and subsequently in partial connexion with that movement. Few good Churchmen, who have made themselves a name any time in the last sixty or even eighty years, but have a place given them in this chain of fathers; and the story of these godly, zealous, and yet eminently prudent men, is an example in our later days of change and disruption, which must certainly be regarded as well-timed. Steady conviction, sensibly following out the end in view by rational, persistent efforts, is at all times pleasant to observe. It gives a sort of confidence in the stability of the right, which is now and then necessary to sustain our courage; and we believe few generations need such pictures and such lessons more than our own, who have had to trace in what, at least in retrospection, seems a short period, so many careers of early brightness, of change, and of final disappearance from the field of our vision—leaving an inevitable sense of disappointment and desertion.

As the type and representative of these peculiar qualities, Joshua Watson, the editor's main and avowed subject, stands the central figure of the group, and as such deserving of especial study. His is a name to us all, and perhaps little more than a name to our younger readers; for those who are only actors and workers, and that not on their own account, but under the shadow of a cause and a principle, are apt to live rather in their works than on men's lips and in their memories. Yet whatever the force of the impression we have retained of him, the nature of that impression will be the same in us all. Rarely, indeed, do we meet with a character of such consistency, whose whole life was such a natural sequence, so uniform in its principles, so unswerving in its course, so sustained by a fixed code of right and wrong, carried out as far as human infirmity will permit with undeviating rectitude. In him we have an illustration how the world, or we will rather say society, is affected by

an exhibition of real fidelity and trustworthiness, not as negative qualities withholding from error, but as positive, active, influential principles, accomplishing important results. There is something really startling in the confidence and sense of reliance he inspired. We are constantly struck by language held towards him by his friends, often in station, his superiors, of implicit faith in his word, his judgment, his honesty of purpose, not only as present qualities, but as of certain continuance, and always to be reckoned on. Our own experience would lead us to strong misgivings of such undoubting confidence in any creature, however highly we had reason to think of him; but really in this case there is no evidence of the trust being misplaced. None of his friends seems to have been disappointed in Joshua Watson's honesty, fidelity, disinterestedness, sincerity, and sympathy. They always depended on them, and they never seemed to fail. No doubt a pre-eminently good understanding and correct judgment are indispensable to the full public adequate exhibition of this excellence; but it was the moral element in his character which gained it such weight. He possessed that invaluable virtue, quality, habit, practice, whatever we call it, never to disappoint reasonable expectation. He was clearly something to lean upon. All his friends knew Joshua Watson would help them if he could, and do his best, not by fits and starts, but with constant care. He was never so far engrossed with schemes of his own as not to be able to turn to those of his friends, and take a subordinate, executive part. He kept an active mind under, and schooled himself to be content, not always to originate, even in his own peculiar line, and to be the patient, watchful, intelligent worker-out of plans that others set going. He was always alive to the work other people were doing, its importance, extent, ability; and, busy as he always was, was not one of those busy men who undertake so much that they think they do everything. Possessed of very strong convictions, he held these convictions in check, and kept guard over himself always to see things as they are; neither heightened by imagination nor lowered by prejudice; assuming in himself, even where least tempted, a full share of natural weaknesses, and using all proper precautions against them. Again, we note a singular guardedness never to presume, or to allow his prominence in affairs to supplant the actual heads from their due honours; and an habitual caution never to use his influence as patronage. These, amongst other qualities, which will come forward in a fuller analysis of his character, account for the extraordinary confidence it inspired, and which found expression in what often sounds extreme language.

Van Mildert writes, as Dean of Paul's, grateful for his prudent advice in the difficulty Queen Caroline threw them into:—'I never yet found you a broken reed to lean upon, and I am persuaded I never shall;' and another, 'I never have and I never shall be disappointed in you.' The widowed Mrs. Rose, after long experience, calls him the source of help that has never yet failed her; and the Canadian Bishop Inglis, in a flight of enthusiasm on hearing of Joshua Watson's illness, writes:—'His name, his bare existence on our planet, is something. Yea, it is hope, and strength, and power.' We are not commending such an abandonment to an idea as these last words imply; but it is something that no rude shock ever came to change the tone and throw contempt on this hyperbolic eulogy.

Joshua Watson's birth and training were, we believe, especially friendly to the development of his characteristic excellences. His father was the younger son of a Cumberland statesman, as the class of landed yeomen are called in that county, and had very early expressed the wish to become a clergyman, a desire which his father somewhat angrily repressed. Checked in this first aspiration he could not settle at home, but set off in his seventeenth year to make his fortune in London. Here he got a situation as shop-boy, of ten pounds a year, from which he rose gradually till, ten years later, he was successfully established as a wine merchant on Tower Hill. But his first tastes had not deserted him, and those who knew him in old age felt that he would have adorned the profession he had so early marked out for himself. He married Dorothy Robson, sister of the then master of Sherborne Hospital, Durham, by whom he had two sons; John James Watson, afterwards rector of Hackney and of Diggeswell, Herts, and Archdeacon of S. Alban's; and Joshua, the subject of this memoir, born on Ascension Day, May 9, 1771.

'When he (Mr. Watson), had lived to see the wish which he had so earnestly cherished for himself fulfilled in the elder of his two sons, and the younger was able to take the more active part of his share in the city business, he withdrew by degrees from the occupation of the counting-house, and made his residence in the suburban village of Homerton, near the spot on which the newly-founded church of St. Barnabas now stands. Here he lived till the death of his wife in A.D. 1812; when, yielding to the affectionate request of his children, he consented to make his abode alternately with them, passing the summer months at Diggeswell, and the winter at Clapton. At Clapton, at the house of his younger son, when he had completed his eighty-second year, and increasing infirmity had prevented any further removal, he died on the 12th of August, 1821.

'Those who remember the father of Joshua Watson, describe him as a man of the simplest habits; one who, though not slothful in business, and rather distinguished for the prudent foresight which is necessary to conduct a merchant's business to success, retained to old age the trustful heart and affectionate spirit of childhood. . . . He left behind him in the words of Bishop Van Mildert, at his most tranquil and Christian-like departure, "an example of

blameless excellence;" from which his son, who had ministered to his declining years "with a sort of devotional delight and satisfaction, derived much in the formation of his own character" while his aged parent lived, and still more in the recollection and imitation of his virtues."

'To these testimonies it may now be added, that, from papers which he left behind, it appears that several years before his death he divided his property between his two sons, reserving to himself a moderate annual allowance for personal expenses, of which, however, he gave away three-fourths in gifts and benefactions.'—Vol. i. pp. 7—9.

While his elder son carried out his own earliest ideal, he designed that the younger should assist him in the labours of his second choice, and gave him education suited to this destination. While John James was sent to the Charterhouse, Joshua was kept at a private school till thirteen. There, however, he acquired the rudiments of classical education under his master's son, a Cambridge graduate. He was afterwards removed to a city school to learn, with other merchants' sons, the mysteries of accounts, book-keeping, and such an acquaintance with continental languages as a year's study could impart; and when scarcely fifteen he was taken into his father's counting-house in Mincing Lane. Under these apparent disadvantages, he contrived in the course of years to acquire a considerable amount of classical and general knowledge. His tastes were always sound and grave. As a school-boy, Josephus had been his favourite, even stolen study, while a turn for romance was indulged by pouring over *Cassandra*, one of those wonderful prolix old tales which are beyond the powers of our feeble modern digestion to get through. He spent 50*l.* his father gave him for books, in a selection of historians and poets, with which he made himself well acquainted, and so far cultivated his judgment, taste, and perception, that his learned and more highly educated friends were subsequently very glad to apply to him for advice and friendly criticism. In the midst of a busy career he seems to have been a reader, with the advantage of a very strong and retentive memory; and in writing he had an easy ready style, which perfectly expressed what he wanted to say. Thus he did not suffer in any sense from what is called a defective education, while we have always believed that a training in a merchant's counting-house, the familiarity with large interests and large sums gained there, tends, under favourable circumstances, such as Joshua Watson would possess with his father, to forming a liberal and generous spirit. We think all persons whose business it is to collect money, to persuade others to give of their substance in an exceptional, profuse, extensive fashion, will say that merchants, bankers, and persons connected with trade in some way or other, have the most munificent notions of giving. While the virtues of integrity and honesty have a

chance of being studied in a wider, more thoughtful, and intelligent spirit, where buying and selling is the business of life, and there are constant questions brought before the conscience, than when the practice of them is taken for granted, and the mind is never tried with difficult and knotty points. People often fail in high-minded, unselfish honesty, from ignorance, and from a notion founded on this consciousness of ignorance, that they must be on their guard; look after themselves, and so forth. Women, from this cause, often show to disadvantage in business transactions. The same has been said of clergymen, with perhaps some truth, and for a like reason; assuming themselves professionally removed from danger of sin in this direction. A story is told in these memoirs of William Stevens, one of the chain of devoted laymen from Evelyn and Nelson, up to Joshua Watson, whose education and calling were also mercantile, which bears on this point. Hearing a young lady in whom he was interested boast to some of her female acquaintances of a cheap bargain which she fancied she had made, 'O, yes,' said Stevens, 'you are fit to live in the world.' From any one else, says the narrator, the speech would have gone for one of little meaning; but from him, who, as she was well aware, was one who detested all craft and covetousness, it came with heart searching power. His acquaintance with trade had led him to analyse all the injustice and even dishonesty involved in cheap bargains, and in the craving after them. We have no doubt that Joshua Watson's earliest training for his various and important trusts was not only excellent as giving him a perfect knowledge of business and accounts, but as cultivating his conscience, showing him where lie the pitfalls of temptation, giving him higher ideas of the duties and responsibilities connected with money, and a clearer perception of fairness and justice where the rights of others are concerned.

He had been admitted his father's partner when of age, and evidently showed talents for business; for on his father's retirement, he was, about the year 1810, sought out by a firm in Mark Lane, and requested to become partner in their concern; where, chiefly by executing government contracts, a sort of traffic which from all accounts craved wary walking, he made the whole of his fortune, and in 1814 retired, at the age of forty-three, while this fortune was continually increasing, to devote himself to the public labours of charity and benevolence which already engaged much of his time and interest. The following extract from a letter to a subordinate in his own and his father's business, written some years after this event, shows a scrupulous conscience always alive to the temptation of buying and selling, and bears on what we have been saying:—

'I have no taste or talent for preaching; but the occasion leads me to add a hope that the just view you took of the dangers and difficulties of the life from which you were withdrawing, will become clearer and stronger as you are more and more removed from their influence. Whilst engaged in all the hurry and bustle of business, and in a daily struggle perhaps for the very being of one's family, many an iniquity in buying and selling is lost sight of in the dust our own contentions raise about us, which, when we are away from the field of action, will begin to shew itself in its true light. Many a thing, which perhaps the custom of trade never allowed one to scruple about, or which the arts of competitors in a market seemed to make a necessary part of self-defence, may then possibly appear in more questionable colours. I know pretty well the temptations to which your mercantile career from its commencement to the present hour has exposed you. In my own case I rejoiced when "the snare was broken;" and I can truly add that the wish to make my escape, and to be secure against the risk of being "again entangled therein and overcome," prevailed much in my early retirement from the profits of Mark Lane, which, however they have since failed, were certainly at the time not a little tempting.

'You will not wonder, therefore, if, though late, and under different circumstances as *your* change is made, it still seems a subject of congratulation; for though without doubt every state and condition has its own peculiar temptations and trials, yet those with which one's own experience has made one most conversant must always make the strongest impression. . . . You will however, I trust, excuse it, and not think I am taking too much upon me if, at such a time and under such circumstances, I add in conclusion an earnest intreaty, that before you are plunged again into new cares, in your entry on a new and untried state of life, you would fairly and honestly examine into the past, and judging yourself by very different rules than the world prescribes, give thanks whenever you have overcome the temptations to which your condition exposed you, and repent wherever they have surprised or been an overmatch for you.'—Vol. i. pp. 144—146.

This is certainly an excellent state of mind in which to enter on the charge and distribution of other people's money, which was one of Joshua Watson's especial vocations, a charge so often broken, through carelessness, and an absence of a fit sense of responsibility, by persons who assume in themselves the nicest sense of honesty and honour; the more exact and stainless from never having been soiled by trade and the habit of bargaining. A very exact order in keeping papers and accounts was part of this conscientiousness. Indeed, as an accountant, he seems to have been unrivalled. The editor especially adduces the case of the national subscription for the German States, that had suffered under the desolating campaigns of the last years of Napoleon.

'The great misery which prevailed in those districts of Germany had at an early date in the year suggested a plan for its relief. An association was formed with great energy and liberality in the City of London, to which Joshua Watson was a subscriber, and had a seat at the board by which its funds were administered. But he was not content without a further extension of the benefit, under more direct religious influence. He went to Archbishop Manners-Sutton, and represented to him that it was due to the honour of the Church of England in the eyes of Europe that she should not be left behind in such a work of mercy, and at such a time. The Archbishop answered his

appeal as he was wont to do; he would consent to originate a subscription in Westminster, if Mr. Watson would manage the details. Eventually it was arranged that Mr. Watson should be secretary, with the assistance of Mr. Ackermann, an intelligent native of the fatherland. The plan prospered, and was forwarded by many most influential persons. A king's letter was obtained for a collection in the churches, and Parliament made a grant of 100,000*l.* payable to the Archbishop. But Archbishop Sutton had so great a dread of becoming a public accountant, that he would almost have declined the trust, had not Joshua Watson again come to his assistance, and made such an arrangement with the Bank of England as relieved him from the toil of figures and calculations. By a skilful co-operation with local committees formed on the Continent, the disbursement and distribution of the money was so managed, that Sir George Rose, who was so long conversant with the business of the Treasury, declared that no such specimen of clear and exact accounts as this had ever come under his eye.—Vol. i. pp. 152, 153.

The expenses of distributing more than a hundred thousand pounds, in two hundred and eleven gifts, to foreign committees were less than a hundred pounds. We do not wonder, therefore, at the Archbishop's hearty thanks to such an ally when the business was over, or at the congratulations from all concerned at the 'brilliant finish' of his labours. Indeed, an impression was made on Manners Sutton, which leads to the implicit reliance on Joshua Watson's judgment he ever after shewed, and even to a more tangible proof of regard; for when, during the panic of 1826, it was reported that Joshua Watson was a large sufferer, the Archbishop urgently pressed upon him pecuniary assistance. Help was not needed, and the offer was declined with grateful thanks. His own private property had indeed been in some degree involved in the general crash, but the funds of all the societies were in safe keeping; nor were his own means for wide and liberal benevolence and almsgiving permanently lessened. We have been led first to dwell upon these business-like qualities as forming the foundation of his influence, without which he could not have taken the stand he did in church affairs; but they occupy a very subordinate part in the memoir, which enters at once into the long catalogue of clerical friendships formed early in life, and which at once proved and strengthened the natural bias of his tastes and sentiments.

His brother John James Watson's first curacy was under Jonathan Boucher, vicar of Epsom, a schoolfellow of their father's, who had subsequently gone to America, become tutor to Washington, and on his ordination taken preferment in Maryland, from which he was ejected for his bold unflinching loyalty at the time of the revolution. It was Joshua Watson's frequent practice to go down to his brother from Saturday to Monday, and he soon won not only the good Rector's regard, but such a share of respect for 'the remarkable judgment and discerning powers' he already detected in his

young friend, that he used to ask him to revise his sermons for him. There he became acquainted with William Stevens, the cousin of Bishop Horne, the friend of Jones of Nayland, and the guardian of the Church's interests, in the last half of the eighteenth century. He especially devoted himself to ameliorating the condition of the poorer clergy, and befriending their widows and children; and was the supporter of the Clergy Orphan School—a charge which Joshua Watson inherited from him in after years. He too formed a high opinion of his young friend's sagacity; for, after recording some of Stevens' good deeds, we read,—

'Those who knew the subject of our memoir in his riper age will be able to imagine with what sympathy of feeling he must have conversed with the good elder, who could with such refinement of Christian kindness direct the hand of charity. But while there can be no doubt that the example contributed much to fix the aims of the younger of this pair of friends, there was also something in the early-matured judgment and well-directed energy of Joshua Watson, which Stevens viewed with indulgent admiration; so that when he entered the room where older heads were assembled, the old man would say in his peculiar tone of mirthful earnest, "Here comes Joshua, the first man of the age."

'In one point it is believed that the same early judgment withheld him from an entire assent to the views of these aged friends. Bishop Horne, Jones, and Stevens, and most of their theological allies, were Hutchinsonians. Jones, in particular, defended the Hutchinsonian principles with some rigour; and he was not without the zealous support of some younger disciples.'—Vol. i. pp. 38, 39.

And from this the Editor passes on to a statement of Hutchinson's opinions, and his 'jealousy of what is called Natural Religion.'

The sketch given of Stevens' life and death, the consistency of his course from youth to old age, is in remarkable analogy with Joshua Watson's. With him, no doubt, good example would have the weight it is designed to have; it would assist him in marking out a course for himself—so far, that is, as such a deliberate process is possible to a practical mind; and there was in him no tendency to impulse and sudden change of plan, to disturb a preconceived ideal.

It is pleasant to be reminded, as Mr. Churton's book reminds us, of a race of worthies whose names live still in pious memories and in particular associations, and to find in what is called the 'dead age' examples of zealous religion, of warm-hearted charity, of tender, devoted friendship; all tinged by the age in which they showed themselves, and by touches of wit, humour, and poetry, characteristic of the English soil in which they grew. There is something particularly hearty in all we hear of Jones of Nayland, whether in connexion with his friend Glasse or Stevens; and a young man must be said to have begun his religious life under favourable auspices who was admitted to a circle so genuine, so simple in their lives, single in their aims,

and vigorous in their intellects, as we feel this society to have been. That they made a deep impression on young and congenial minds is evident from the school they formed, carrying on the same traditions and animated by the same spirit and perseverance.

A chapter is devoted to Joshua Watson's contemporaries—those who started the same race with him, and whose names are still associated with his own. All these were first introduced to him through his elder brother, between whom and himself existed through life the closest fraternal affection and community of interests, leading to constant unreserved intercourse; so that the intimacy of childhood, instead of waning, as it often does, with years, grew a stronger, more confidential bond as every year passed by. Sir John Richardson, in looking back on the origin of their friendship, speaks of having been first recommended, as an undergraduate, by the Master of University College, to cultivate the acquaintance of John James Watson, who soon after introduced him to his father, mother, and younger brother. The elder brother possessed one of those urbane, generous tempers that are happy in others' success; and his own zealous discharge of the sacred office to which he was dedicated would indeed act on his brother as a call of God to himself—as a claim on all the family to a particular devotion to the Church in which one of them was called to minister. Another friend, Thomas Sikes, of Guilsborough, in Northamptonshire, who lives still in many a recollection, was calculated to influence his opinions, though no doubt his natural bias was in the same direction. Mr. Sikes was a born controversialist; no one could listen to his eager flow of argument without regarding him as the type of a class. He began this course early; for, being first placed at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, he presently found the views, for so many years identified with that Hall, so opposed to his convictions, that he removed to Pembroke College, where he took his B.A. 1788, while Joshua Watson was still in his eighteenth year. It was Thomas Sikes who prophesied of the confusion in the Church that would follow on the revival of certain doctrines too long kept out of sight: 'Our confusion, now-a-days, is chiefly owing to the want of asserting this one article of the Creed (the Holy Catholic Church); and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival, when it is thrust on minds unprepared, and on an uncatechized Church.' This friendship was cemented by Joshua Watson's union with his sister, Mary, daughter of Thomas Sikes, Esq., banker, in Mansion-house Street, and niece of Charles Daubeney, Archdeacon of Sarum, which took place June, 1797, in his twenty-seventh year.

'With this excellent and highly-gifted woman he lived for thirty-four years in happy union, finding in her an admirable counsellor in the best aims of his life, entire sympathy with his thoughts on matters of duty, and a vigorous intellect, which attracted many minds of the first order to the social meetings of the clergy and laity under his roof. In the private diary of the year 1817, noticing the twentieth anniversary of his wedding-day, he adds the words, *Ter terque beatus*.

'Of the issue of this marriage one daughter only lived beyond childhood; their first-born son, Joshua Barnston, and an infant, Henry, both dying in the year 1802.'—Vol. i. pp. 15, 16.

Another still more familiar name is early associated with Joshua Watson's, and continues to be so through these volumes—that known to us as 'Norris of Hackney.' Henry Handley Norris was born in the same year with himself (January, 1771), the son and grandson of two wealthy London merchants. He early formed the desire to take orders—a wish which was long resolutely combatted by his father, who designed him for his own calling; but the political convulsions and the attacks on religion which disturbed Europe at the time when he first began to think for himself, determined him to the duty of devoting his life to the cause of truth, at the sacrifice of private wealth, liberty, and ease. He always regarded his first introduction to Joshua Watson as providential. It arose from the accident of both, as young men of three-and-twenty, being appointed to collect money for a public dinner to the Shropshire militia, quartered at Hackney. 'From this accidental introduction a friendship grew up, which continued unbroken for near sixty years.' They soon took counsel together on the subjects which were already all important to them both. In a year's time, we read extracts from a few pages of a private journal kept by Norris, while on a visit with his new friend to Mr. Sikes, of Guilsborough, giving the heads of conversations on the highest themes; and along with these, indications of the line of thought which they were pursuing. He notes as a significant discovery that the three estates did not properly consist of King, Lords, Commons, but Lords Spiritual, Lords Temporal, and Commons; and enters a regret for the decay in patristic learning.

'Nov. 14. Rode with Watson to N—, to examine a collection of books for sale. It was lamentable to see works of many of the venerable Fathers of the Church, and numbers of our ancient worthies, lying mouldy and neglected, stained entirely through by the damp, and half consumed by worms. We rescued about sixty of the most valuable from the ruin which seemed to threaten them. The terms demanded and acquiesced in were two shillings a-piece.

"Nov. 17. Watson employed himself all the morning in polishing up the covers of the rescued books; I assisted T. Sikes in planting. But this evening, about five o'clock, we experienced a severe loss by the departure of Joshua Watson, who set off on his return to London. In him is centered every requisite to complete the character of a pleasant companion and sincere friend. For

the former capacity he possesses a strong mind, well stored with thoughts on every subject, which a most retentive memory enables him to draw forth at pleasure. Though diffident in delivering his opinion, he is by no means reserved, and is equally happy when giving information or receiving it himself. His judgment is correct, his attention always at command; and whilst in arguing he sticks close to his subject, and defends the point he contends for with acuteness, he is always open to conviction, and ever ready to acknowledge it. For the latter, unaffected good-nature, generosity, and every Christian virtue, stimulated and enlivened by a fervent piety and zeal for religion.—Vol. i. pp. 58, 59.

Van Mildert, subsequently Bishop of Durham, was another early friend. They became acquainted in 1796, soon after his preferment to the living of St. Mary-le-Bow; and we soon find, in spite of Joshua Watson's secular calling, and the six years by which he was his junior, that he had inspired his friend with a great respect for his opinion and judgment. Van Mildert had been appointed Boyle Lecturer, and was engaged in publishing his Lectures in 1806; on which occasion he showed his estimate of these qualities by sending his proofs to him, and anxiously pressing for his full and candid opinion on all difficult points. After apologising for the time and labour he is exacting, he concludes, on one occasion,—

'Believe me, it is neither compliment nor affectation when I say, that after the benefit I have already derived from your judicious and friendly criticisms, I cannot comfortably and satisfactorily go into the press, without having passed the ordeal of your inspection.'—Vol. i. p. 67.

And again,—

March 29. I have just met, in my way hither, a friend who has represented to me your multiplicity of troubles and difficulties. I have therefore resolved to give you to-morrow a complete day of rest, so far as the removal of my intended burden can affect it; I have therefore pocketed No. XIV. to carry home again; and, if upon a re-perusal I can satisfy myself with it, it shall go to the printer without giving you any further trouble. If not, I will endeavour to look in upon you some evening in next week, just to take your advice on a few particular passages. I am indeed very much grieved to have already made such unreasonable encroachments on your time, but I know not where to find a friend who can really be a substitute for you.'—Vol. i. pp. 69, 70.

This work ran through several editions, establishing Van Mildert's reputation as a divine, and leading to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, which he afterwards held. A curious incident is mentioned—curious, that is, in connexion with the greatness of his future fortunes—relating to a debt contracted from the fault of others in rebuilding his parsonage in Kent. When this became known to his friends, Joshua Watson, Sikes, and others, they resolved to discharge the debt anonymously; but having failed in their intended secrecy, the following extract from Van Mildert's letter expresses a natural mixture of feelings:—

'There is a pleasure, an exquisite one, in having such friends; but the wound given to the spirit of independence, by being obliged to make such a use of them, is not easily healed. It has been my misfortune to be more or less

embarrassed ever since I have been a beneficed man; and every additional benefice has brought its additional burdens, and made me poorer than before. So that, in spite of all the friendly helps I have met with, I still am, and to all human appearance ever shall be, a necessitous man. But it may be the will of Providence that these trials should be sent to correct that pride which perhaps you will think these sentiments discover. Be it so; and I may be enabled so to apply them! May you, my good friend, never know anything more of these troubles than by your ability and disposition to remove them!—Vol. i. p. 75.

That personal expense had not led to these difficulties, we may gather from an anecdote told in connexion with Lord Liverpool's conscientious distribution of patronage:—

'He (Van Mildert) was then at his country living at Farningham, and his domestic economy, under the pressure already related, was so strictly maintained, that the Premier's private messenger could find only one servant—a female presiding at the churn. She was willing to seek her master, who had walked out into the garden, if the messenger would take her place, and keep the churn in motion.'—Vol. i. p. 138.

At this time, when he had to come to London, his lodgings were with Joshua Watson, in Mincing Lane; and the arrangement suited both so well, that, when he was made Bishop of Llandaff, the two friends became joint-tenants of a house in Great George Street, Westminster. After such marks of intimacy, it is significant to observe the profound respect maintained towards his friend in all letters and communications. No private friendship could remove in Joshua Watson's mind the distance between the Bishop of Durham and his former lay counsellor, or lessen the expressions of honour and respect due to him.

Another distinguished and lasting friendship, formed about the same time, through Van Mildert, was with Christopher Wordsworth, brother of the poet, and eventually Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; to whom the Editor pays a warm tribute of affectionate eulogy. 'We met,' Dr. Wordsworth used to say, 'and became friends at once'—a testimony amongst many others to what must have been the remarkable attractions of Joshua Watson's manner. There is no indication of any of the deficiencies popularly attributed to a city training. He impressed men of the highest education and fullest minds with qualities and powers which placed him at once on the level of perfect intellectual and social equality. There was, too, we may assume, a native cheerfulness which prevented the weight of the interests on which his mind was intent from lapsing into heaviness. As a boy, at some place of public amusement, George the Third singled him out, saying to his attendants, 'Look at that happy boy!' and his old age, as described by those about him, was marked by much kindly playfulness. No one could act well with others in the innumerable affairs in which he was brought into contact with them, without

tact and other social gifts in some remarkable degree; and he no doubt possessed an intuitive discernment, an instinct of self-conduct, which would tell as favourably in private intercourse, as they did on more public occasions, when these qualities assisted him to carry so many important points, and to maintain harmony and union where party spirit imperilled both.

Those were times when politics were closely blended with religion; and we find added to this list of Churchmen, certain, secular names with which Joshua Watson was allied,—Gifford, editor of the '*Anti-Jacobin*,' John Bowles, Reeves, and others opposed to the Horne Tooke school, and 'the advocates of the new Gallican liberties.' We find him in communication with William Cobbett, who, when he first came from America, was received as a martyr to his testimony against republicanism. After a time, however, when his real character showed itself, his self-sufficiency and unscrupulousness repelled his respectable allies; and on detecting in Joshua Watson an intention to shake him quietly off, he published 'the only malicious abuse' which was ever attached to his name. Joshua Watson's apology for this early acquaintance may apply to many similar alliances: 'We were then young, and his violence was rather a recommendation; he was so hearty in hating 'what we hated.' These Tory interests were, however, only digressions from the main objects of his life.

Through the influential friends we have enumerated, he had been introduced to Archbishop Manners-Sutton, as one whose genius might be made valuable to the Church.

'Of the degree in which he afterwards enjoyed the confidence of that prelate he would often speak with unfeigned wonder. His part, he would say, was simply to lay information before him of things which, in his higher sphere, he could not see with his own eyes. The faithfulness and ability with which this was done advanced him, without expectation or seeking of his own, to an authority in counsel which his humble spirit could hardly realize to itself, though to others who witnessed such discerning diligence it appeared the most natural thing in the world.'—Vol. i. p. 94.

He and Norris had become members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge before the close of the last century, and got the character of reformers for changes they set about and accomplished under the protest of certain old members who predicted ruin. However, the finances were soon trebled under their plan of District Committees, a machinery which afterwards proved of infinite value in the establishment of the National Society. This important scheme was first planned in 1811, at the house of Joshua Watson, and in concert with H. H. Norris and John Bowles. Its origin and organization are given at length by the Editor; indeed, his work is a complete dictionary of reference for all the labours and workers of the

orthodox party during a very energetic and successful period of united effort.

‘Joshua Watson was the Treasurer of the National Society from the date of its foundation; he watched over its prosperity and efficiency with unceasing and laborious care from the beginning; and his interest in it survived when, after thirty years of diligent service, he resigned the care of its funds to other hands. There were some of the first promoters of the new Society who would have had it made a department of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and some who objected to the name which was finally chosen, as if it had been borrowed from late Gallican precedents: but its meaning was explained by the principle set forth in its first report, “that the national religion should be made the groundwork of national education,” and “that the first and chief thing to be taught to the children of the poor was the doctrine of the Gospel, according to the excellent Liturgy and Catechism provided by the Church of England.”’—Vol. i. pp. 103, 104.

The body of friends we have enumerated, all inspired by the same views and aims, meeting constantly to advance the same cause, and to encourage each other by interchange of thought, and now gradually collecting into one district, were fast forming into a party. Joshua Watson, in 1811, took a house at Clapton in his brother's parish of Hackney. H. H. Norris had two years previously undertaken the spiritual charge of the southern portion of Hackney parish. A chapel of ease was built for him not far from his own house in Grove Street. There he was perpetual curate, and laboured for forty years, acquiring himself a name, till Norris of Hackney became a household word with Church people. It was under his auspices—the three friends forming the nucleus, and able to exercise a very wide hospitality—that they, and such as assembled round them, came to be called the Hackney Phalanx. Joshua Watson was an invaluable man for a party to possess, he probably formed a main element of strength and stability in this; but he was not a party man, as it seems to us, by nature. He was not indisposed to compromise; he could work with people who differed from him, he was always able to see the merits of those opposed to his own views, and anxiously charitable in his judgments. Norris, from higher spirits, keener temperament, and an energetic sociability, had undoubtedly the make of a genial partizan; he inspired in those about him a warm sense of cheerful companionship along with respect for his theological acquirements and vigilant orthodoxy, remarkably exhibited in his vigorous Appeals against the Bible Society and the Jews' Society. Then we find Lloyd, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, writing to him under the sobriquet of the Patriarch:—

‘I used to say of Van, that he was so great in his knowledge of the exact doctrines of the Church of England, that orthodoxy oozed out of his pores, and he would talk it in his dreams. Now I hold your Holiness to be equally great in the knowledge of our ecclesiastical discipline,—nothing doubting of your doctrine,—and I suppose there is not a Church in the universe with which you are

not so intimately acquainted as to be able to state at a moment's notice every heretic abiding within the reach of it."—Vol. i. p. 282.

There are testimonies to the happy impression left by intercourse with this whole zealous society. As when the Irish divine, Dr. Hales, speaks of the Hackney Phalanx, and the hospitable kindness with which they entertained him while carrying his book through the press, 'the recollection of which kindness made his heart warm to every Englishman he met,' and the Editor adds:—

'None who survive to remember the moral influence of the Hackney phalanx, an influence won by the union of men who were bound together by a disinterested love of the best things, will wonder at the warmth of this testimony. It was an influence which for many following years drew to these houses a varying but never failing band of the wise and good, and from which many a young student in the discipline of life and truth found his aims directed and his youthful vows confirmed.'—Vol. i. p. 98.

In a letter to the Rector of Hackney, Norris gives with pleasant deliberateness his views and motives for the formation of a party. It is at once characteristic of the man and of the Church party of that time which, we must note, was remarkable for, and also found its safeguard in, having no head, only a point for general gathering, and united operation:—

"MY DEAR VICAR,—Had I nothing to reply to your last, gratitude would extort a letter from me to thank you for your very entertaining and bountiful despatch. Indeed, I never think of Hackney without being proud of my relation to it, and rejoice exceedingly that I have been anyways instrumental in the celebration of its praises, though your report is the first intimation I have had of having rendered it this piece of service. Rasselas, you know, concludes his researches after happiness with the resolution of returning to his own country, and forming there a society of chosen men; and why should not I engage in the same undertaking? We read yesterday of Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek casting their heads together with one consent; and why are we to suffer our English phlegm to keep us in a state of individuality? I want to see a centre formed, to which every zealously-affected Churchman may resort, and counterplot the numerous and most subtle devices against our very existence which every day is bringing to light. If we but knew our strength as our enemies do theirs, we should all be encouraged and strengthened. Dr. Hales has returned to Ireland thus benefitted; he thought himself like Elijah, but now knows that the cause of religion is not deserted; that, notwithstanding the prevailing apostasy, there are many who have not bowed the knee to Baal. I have done some good, therefore, by this modest assurance of mine; and so, friend John, I shall proceed, and wherever I can find a sound Churchman, I will lay violent hands upon him if I can. Yea, as David resolves, "Mine eyes shall look upon such as are faithful in the land, that they may dwell with me."—Vol. i. pp. 99, 100.

This absence of a head was the result not only of circumstances but of principles. It was never Joshua Watson's wish to undertake responsibilities where he could help it. In organizing societies he desired to leave all that could be left to the will of constituted authorities. This was shown in the system of missionary appointments by the Society for the Propagation of the

Gospel. He was earnest, as one of the main directors of the National Society, to leave the choice of books to the clergy, in opposition to the proposal that selections should be confined to the Christian Knowledge Society list. He argued that the parochial clergy might as safely be trusted with the teaching of their schools as with the charge of delivering Christian doctrines to their parishioners, and quietly carried his point. His spirit throughout was a different spirit, and grasping less at influence than we find in what we must call the opposite party; and in later years, during the troubles of 1843, he wrote of party leaderships—

‘Nothing has yet fallen out,’ he wrote, ‘contrary to my expectations, but I do not, therefore, feel confidence in my fears. Rather when I see how good and great men are blinded on one side, I remember how we all deceive ourselves, and am willing to believe myself an alarmist. . . . Indeed, I fear my own misgivings on the subject, and have not dared for a long time to realize my apprehensions as to the natural results of party leaderships, which will ordinarily be little different in a Newman or a Simeon.’—Vol. ii. p. 201.

He was alive, too, to the danger of unwise partizanship in causing reaction, and chilling many of its followers into a ‘fatal state of coldness and indifference.’ There was, as far as we can see, no leadership in this knot of practical workers. They were a united band, thinking alike, and acting together and acquiring considerable power; but everything was done under the cover of constitutional authority; so far, their influence was anonymous. It was shared with others, and if Joshua Watson, or Norris, or Hugh James Rose were the actual power it made all the difference, both in their own feelings and in the apprehension of their friends that it was under cover, and in constant reference to Bishops and dignitaries.

It must be owned that this party thus organized, and thus headless, had for the time a prosperous career. Zealous, active, with definite intelligible plans of practical good, they commended themselves especially to the respect of the then Premier, who showed himself most conscientious in the matter of Church patronage, and was inclined from circumstances to trust the Watsons. The elder brother had been his schoolfellow, and we read in a note—

‘In a list of the scholars at the Charterhouse about A.D. 1787, the name of John James Watson occupies the second place in the sixth form; the name of Robert Banks Jenkinson, afterwards second Earl of Liverpool, and for many years Prime Minister, stands eleventh. This upright and benevolent statesman was a little junior to Archdeacon Watson; and when he followed him to Oxford and to University College, being troubled in the college-hall with the assiduities of another former schoolfellow, who had acted the bully at school, but made court to him as a young man of rank at the University, he changed his seat to Watson’s side. “I shall be obliged to you,” he said, “if you will let me sit here; for I do not particularly want the slaver of the dog who can no longer bite.”—Vol. i. p. 13.

Joshua Watson was not in a position to receive favours, and was scrupulous in asking them for others; but he writes on one occasion on the preferment of some good men in that strain of hope, and trust in the future which belongs to success:—

“ You will have heard, in course, of our excellent and amiable friend Pott’s preferment to a stall at St. Paul’s; but perhaps you do not know that it is one of the very best things in Bishop Howley’s gift. It will, I hope, set that good man at ease in his profession. Lyall, too, a capital fellow *for a Trinity man*, succeeds to Blomfield’s chaplainship at London House; and T. L. Strong, to the great comfort of Bishop Van Mildert, gains a little living from the Chapter of St. Paul’s. And so the party here, which has been enriched by the addition of the Cambridges, is in high spirits, rejoicing that it is well with their friends, (Prov. xi. 10,) and looking forward with increased confidence to new causes of congratulation on the same grounds of general joy.”—Vol. i. p. 237.

Norris’s nature was not a personally ambitious one. He scrupled to receive a prebendal stall of little value from the Bishop of Llandaff, lest it should bring a doubt of his disinterestedness. ‘When I take preferment,’ he said, ‘I cease to be a volunteer in the service of the Church,’ which was the position he preferred. He liked the liberty of an unencumbered existence, and writes gratefully of the welcome he found amongst friends. ‘Frequently have I been constrained to acknowledge, and I hope not without gratitude, that few men can have so many delightful homes open to them, and such friends to greet and cherish them.’ Indeed, we in our day cannot look upon the bright career of this happy warm-hearted hospitable band of fellow workers without a touch of regret for ourselves—a touch, let us add, of personal regret, in the case of those who, like our very selves, shared at whatever distance of age and station in the friendship, and kindness, and encouragement, and hospitality of that pleasant old house, and that genial old host, in Grove Street, Hackney. Perhaps in nothing was this geniality more conspicuous than in the attentions extended to young and active clergymen by Mr. Norris. It is a comfort to look back to those days, to which we can apply the appropriate lines of one not unfamiliar to the Hackney brotherhood:—

“ We walked with open hearts and tongue,
Affectionate and true;
A pair of friends, though I was young,
And Matthew seventy-two.

This hearty, sociable co-operation was a feature of those times and belonged to all sides. They thought they had difficulties to contend with, but work is pleasant and trials not unbearable where there is a concentration of interest and a band of fervent hearty supporters to fall back upon.

Though we hear of a phalanx, which suggests ideas of war and contention, the Editor keeps clear of all direct mention of, and even makes very slight allusion to, the opposite party, in

consideration of whom this compact body of the church's defenders had organized itself. No party names, active as such were on their own side during these busy years, find a place here. We note this as a fact, but very far from a matter of reproach or regret. It is only too easy to recal, or even to imagine the clash of arms on many a platform, and in innumerable committee rooms and pulpits; and the fire and mettle and good-humoured defiance with which attacks would be met and rebutted and returned. There are other differences of which we have indications, if not the formal history; friendly contests and favourite measures and schemes failing, through misunderstanding, and the natural interposition of failure in human affairs. Such, for instance, we must consider 'Mant's Bible,' the result of the 'advocacy' of Joshua Watson, with his friends Christopher Wordsworth, Van Mildert, and Middleton, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta.

'But his plan was not altogether followed. What he had designed was a double commentary, one for the student, the other for cottage-readers. The first was to have been prepared by Van Mildert and Middleton, the other by Richard Mant, then Vicar of Coggeshall in Essex, one of Archbishop Sutton's chaplains. The rule proposed to be observed in the selection of notes was to confine all authoritative exposition of texts to divines of the Primitive Church, or of the Church of England since the Reformation: other writers were to be used more sparingly, and only when the Church had given them some sanction by adopting them in common use. The plan was, however, in some degree baffled by the Archbishop committing the task to his own two chaplains, Mr. Mant and Mr. George D'Oyley,—an arrangement with which Joshua Watson would not attempt to interfere, though he did not lose sight of his original purpose, and many years afterwards made another effort to set on foot a Cottage Bible.'—Vol. i. pp. 126, 127.

We are not surprised that the original promoters were not satisfied with the mode in which the task was executed. 'Mant's Bible' has been at least, in a negative sense, a misfortune; but a knowledge of the difficulties of such a task ought to make us lenient critics. Our space will only allow us to refer to the various good works in which Joshua Watson took an active and often an initiative part, in the busiest period of his life, when his powers were at their height, and his influence increased with the success of every undertaking. He was an indefatigable labourer for the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and its treasurer from 1814 to 1833; and equally active for the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, which he helped to remodel from an ecclesiastical board, mainly for administering Government funds and assisting in the support of the North American colonies, into a Missionary Society; and here it is mentioned, that Dr. Wordsworth endeavoured ineffectually to bring about a union with the *Church Missionary Society* at its outset. He was a chief instrument in the growth and furtherance of the colonial episcopacy. The three first colonial Bishops,

Middleton, Inglis, and Broughton, were his close confidential friends, and he was their main stay in procuring assistance from England, for the furtherance of their different undertakings. As the acknowledged authority, he drew up, at the request of the Archbishop, a memorial to be shown to Lord Liverpool, in relation to our East Indian possessions, which, as we read, remind us of the greatness of his services by the state of neglect and apathy from which he and his first friends raised the nation. He was appointed one of the Church Building Commissioners, and so relied upon by his friends as the security against insidious clauses, that they were uneasy if he was once absent from his post. We find him liberal of time and money for the Clergy Orphan School, and the Church Building Society. He was concerned in the founding of King's College, and on the first commencement of the Church Commission was the acknowledged representative of the Church's interests, and deputed by the Archbishop to draw up a scheme, which met the approval of the Duke of Wellington, though, as may be expected, it was not accepted by Lord Grey.

He had evidently a turn for societies; his own talents and temperament suited them, and made them answer; and he seems never to have wearied of this machinery so ready to his hands, though no man could be more jealous, and show greater mistrust, of the use made of societies and religious meetings in their popular development. In the formation of these his plan was to draw up a preliminary series of regulations and rules, which were submitted to his friends: and this first draft evidently went into all the minutiae and niceties of the question; for we find Archdeacon Daubeney, who acted with him in originating the Church Building Society, accepting all as judiciously and correctly drawn, up to the 15th resolution, at which he demurs for a moment. His manner in using his authority must have been one of his chief influences.

'It was of course inseparable from the post of influence which he had now attained, that Joshua Watson should be often called to guide and restrain, as well as sometimes to animate, the exertions of others. His zeal for the best of causes, and his brotherly charity, seem to have worked together in due proportions, and made him at once forbearing towards the weaknesses and indiscretions of good men, and skilful in bringing into action their nobler and better qualities. The letters of many correspondents bear witness to this trait in his character. To bring forward instances of such temperate restraint might be less convenient, as it might exhibit in an unfavourable light the infirmities of some whose names are worthy of honour. But it is impossible not to feel how blessed this influence was, when we see the immediate effect acknowledged by those who came into contact with it, and how he could change a tone of impatient and forward activity, which had been a source of annoyance to others and himself, into one of kindly deference, submitting to a more practical wisdom the decision of schemes which the promoter had at last found to be unmanageable.—Vol. i. p. 195.

Joshua Watson possessed a creative power on such matters, could embrace the whole question while yet in embryo, foresee facilities, and anticipate difficulties and objections, and be the vigilant guardian of the Church's interests under all possible contingencies. Many of the Bishops habitually made him the channel of communication upon the wants of their dioceses. His authority was so widely acknowledged, that people concerned did not like to act without him: thus there are many such testimonies from people in high station, as 'if I find myself by your side I shall know how to act.' 'Your arrangements are always right:' and on occasion of his absence, 'If you suppose we can do without you, you are the only man that thinks so.' And Bishop Blomfield writes, 'I am never easy when you differ from me.' All these honours were not flattery so much as encouragement. We see indications of a constant reticence and modesty, a continual guard over himself to keep his language and conduct down to the tone befitting a subordinate position. Archbishop Howley's testimony was,—

'For himself he could say, that from no man had he received such ready and judicious counsel, or such friendly assistance, free from the smallest taint of selfishness, and guided with the most unaffected and retiring humility.'—Vol. ii. p. 22.

This humility arose in part from a real sense of the dignity of the clerical and episcopal office, and of the privilege it was in any way to be the Church's servant; a sentiment which we may remark, by the bye, shows itself in the delicacy and consideration with which he assisted the poorer clergy. This he often did anonymously, always with tender regard to their feelings, and sometimes with a large liberality which acknowledged a high sense of the social claims and needs of the clerical station. He made short speeches, and never allowed himself to fill the public eye more than was necessary. He had serious scruples, which it was not easy for his friends to overcome, to accepting the honorary degree conferred on him by the University of Oxford, and writes as if he *felt* the conspicuousness, 'the kind of public character which an accumulation of office gives to private labour,' an embarrassment and inconvenience. It was a position of which he felt the dangers, and against which, we learn from his more private biography, he used every means to defend himself. Praise always made him afraid; he avoided talking of self, and kept little record of his own immediate doings; there are constant cautions lest being concerned for religion, should be mistaken by the busy man for religion itself, and a care that no amount of public employment shall interfere with the duties of self-watchfulness, meditation, and private prayer.

Though not a writer himself, he was concerned with his friends in setting on foot those periodicals which at the time represented, or, as in the case of the *Christian Remembrancer*, still express the sentiments of the orthodox Church party. The Editor gives the history of the *British Critic*, from its rise in Jones' and Stevens' time, to its resuscitation under Norris and Joshua Watson, who desired to make it their organ. On this subject are some excellent remarks in letters from Lloyd to Norris, giving his views as to the duties and uses of such a periodical. The history is carried on to the period when it came into the hands of the Phaetons who overset it; causing, as our readers will suppose, many a regret in the staid elders, who witnessed the clever, daring, brilliant process of self-destruction. The *Christian Remembrancer*, which has taken its predecessor's place, as the Church Quarterly, under more prudent counsels, and, as we trust, in a humbler and wiser spirit of duty and obedience to the English Church, had its rise in the same quarter.

'H. H. Norris and Joshua Watson had laboured assiduously, some years before Hugh J. Rose succeeded in establishing the *British Magazine*, to set on foot a periodical which might assist the studies of the clergy, by furnishing literary notices of books, essays of a critical character, chapters of ecclesiastical history and biography, and selections from devotional writers. It was the complaint of Bishop Hobart, when he visited England in 1824, that he found the best educated among the English clergy well versed in other branches of learning or science, but ignorant of theology. There seemed some ground for such complaint, when for a long time it was found impracticable to support a journal of sacred literature. "The country clergy," said Mr. Norris, "are constant readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, deep in the antiquities of the signs of inns, speculations as to what becomes of swallows in winter, and whether hedge-hogs, or other urchins, are most justly accused of sucking milch-cows dry at night." No doubt there was often too much of that

"..... retired leisure,

That in trim gardens takes its pleasure."

A sense of this want induced him in the year 1818 to persuade a zealous and intelligent clergyman, the Rev. Frederick Iremonger, to start the *Christian Remembrancer*, which, after undergoing several changes of editors and plan, has continued to the present day.—Vol. i. pp. 276, 277.

Our remarks have necessarily related to the doings and events of a great many years, without any close attention to chronology. The second volume of this biography bears upon a period which cannot yet be looked back upon without yearnings and without regrets, amounting to pain. We find Norris and Joshua Watson, in 1833, co-operating with the energetic spirits who had begun to make their influence so deeply felt, in the address to the Archbishop, which was at that time put forward to check the scheme for altering the Liturgy, then as now in agitation. Both welcomed them as brother workers; and Norris's nature was one to welcome zeal and intellectual power, such as was now offered to the Church's service, with enthusiasm. The original draft of the

address was submitted to these older and more experienced counsellors; and after undergoing some alterations at their hands, was put forward for signature, not without some previous misgivings on Joshua Watson's part, who wrote to Lyall, Archdeacon of Colchester—

'I had prayed Norris earnestly to lay before his correspondents the danger alike of success or of failure, for I know not which at this time would be worst for the Church. They were, however, too far committed to be open to such counsel as would have suspended all action; their "Suggestions" were already in circulation, though I had not seen them, and many promises of support had poured in upon them. And when such men as Keble, Newman, Palmer, and others were once up and stirring, it was little likely they would be put down by one who had never been applied to for an opinion, or that counsels of expediency would prevail with these high-minded men over the dictates of duty. Something, therefore, was to be done, and so done as to unite as much as might be those whom an association would be sure to disjoin. And for this, nothing seemed to me so promising as an Address to the Primate.'—Vol. ii. p. 31.

The address was signed by more than 7,000 clergy, and was followed by a Lay Declaration from the pen of Joshua Watson, which in a short time received the signatures of 230,000 heads of families. That such co-operation should continue long was not to be expected, though his feeling towards those whose subsequent defection he so deeply regretted was one of constant admiration and regard for their personal qualities and high disinterestedness.

Our space reminds us to turn from Joshua Watson's public labours to those more private and domestic details through which alone we can form a full estimate of a man's worth and character. Throughout his busiest career this domestic element was allowed full scope, and was indeed cultivated with all care. When, as a young man, he had heard his old friend Stevens declare himself only fit for the chimney corner, he had replied, 'that is the place one would most wish to be fit for,' and he was in fact always qualifying himself for this station. In old age he had confessed to his niece, from whose pen there is an exceedingly interesting and valuable record of his closing years, that it had been the aim of his life—

'to acquire a habit of meditation, but his life had been so busy, that he had always had to lament the intrusion of thoughts of action, what was doing, or what ought to be done.'—Vol. ii. p. 274.

In order to maintain time for quietness and meditation he steadily resisted all *work* on Sunday, though his was a sort of work which had something almost of the odour of sanctity in it.

'In the course of this year he had taken up his abode permanently in Westminster, having purchased the lease of a house in Park-street, No. 6, where he continued to reside for the following sixteen years. It was a residence in which hospitality was made to subserve the highest uses of Christian charity; and the remembrance of the spot is still cherished by those who can recall to

mind the assembling of the wise and good within those walls, and yet more, the playful tenderness and unreserved confidence which marked the domestic intercourse of their entertainer; the calm thoughtful hours and sacred rest of the Sundays, with which not even such counsels as his week-days were devoted to were allowed to interfere. One who was in those years a constant guest in Park-street, and was to him almost as a daughter, has recorded her impression of this point of character: "I hope I shall ever remember his exemplary manner of spending Sunday. One thing that strikes me is his determination to avoid all discussion of worldly business of *any* kind, while he allows and encourages mirth and even playfulness in the intervals of serious employment."—Vol. i. p. 238.

Endued as he was with a remarkable constancy, and capable of lasting impressions, he did not trust to natural temperament even in the matter of the affections, but set apart days of commemoration to keep fresh the recollection of those he had lost. His wife, whose death, after thirty-four years of happy union, was a blow felt so acutely as for a time to disable him from public labours, was ever after remembered in this way. In a course like his such precautions may indeed be needed, lest the public life should cloud and obscure the more sacred private life. 'I must,' he says to his niece in after years,

'I must, however, only say in general, that it is a sad persuasion of the impossibility of keeping such exquisite feelings in continual activity in our work-day world that makes me encourage a somewhat strict observance of certain periods in each of our lives, from its tendency to bring back those feelings in their first force and freshness, in order, as our guide tells us, that those impresses of pious resolution and religious purposes, of fear and love, of hope and desire which, by God's grace, present circumstances then wrought in us, may in some sort abide in us.'—Vol. ii. p. 171.

And again, to the same relative, he shows how habitual had been this jealousy of the ensnaring ties of public business, and how careful he was to maintain and keep fresh that inner current of thought and association without which, whatever the nature of his occupations, however closely connected with benevolence and religion, a man must deteriorate.

'In some of the quiet talks which were allowed me with my dear uncle during this winter, he would break through the reserve which was usual with him, and speak freely of those he had loved best on earth; he would sometimes blame his own reserve as selfish, saying that we had a right to be made better by his recollections of the departed. He again dwelt on the use of observing private anniversaries as a means of keeping up communion, and of the great blessing of the ordinance of day and night. Wrong as it would be to disturb others with the expression of our private sorrows, how forlorn would the mourner be did not night come to restore the fellowship, and suffer him to water his couch with his tears! And in times of business and prosperity, what should we do if night did not return to draw, like sickness, its merciful curtain between us and the vanities of life!'—Vol. ii. pp. 235, 236.

But such exercises are as much a sign of constancy as a means towards it, and this in fact was one of his chief powers. It was part of that strength of perseverance which goes so far towards making a great character. We are told, that in vocal music the art by which a singer becomes famous, lies as much in his powers

of sustaining the breath as in quality of tone. Some such vigour and freedom of sustained effort belongs to moral success. What is done in gusts and impulses, subject to breaks and interruptions, inspires little confidence and inevitably brings reaction. But a man who never flags, or relaxes, or changes, himself, is more than consistent in his own person, he is an element of strength to a cause and infuses the principle of constancy in others. This kept him cheerful and hopeful when old age came and active exertion relaxed, and the conduct of affairs was committed to other hands with which he could not always sympathise. He had acquired an habitual confidence in his cause, which satisfied him that all would turn out eventually for the best, though he sat by an observer instead of main stay. He knew that the truth could do without him. By degrees he resigned his honorary appointments and retired to a cheerful and honoured privacy: always consulted and deferred to by his old friends who rested on his judgment, while he himself mistrusted it and watched for the gathering obscurations and failure of power that come with advanced life. Nothing of public interest to the Church passed unnoted by him, and his opinions in letters and conversations are always characterised by his habitual sound sense and charitable judgment; and by a power of entering into the present position of affairs, which indicate how carefully he had always guarded himself from prejudice, or rather, how fully aware he was of the inevitable influence of old association and habit, so as to be able to make allowance for them.

We have spoken of the happy contagion of consistency and perseverance. It would not be easy to find a pleasanter illustration of this than is shown in the band of friends whose labours are recorded in this book—of friends who began their career together, and who worked together in unbroken harmony till death called them to their reward in a ripe old age. We call men fortunate who have the fit accompaniment of old age, ‘troops of friends;’ but such blessings are the result as much of care and of pains as of circumstances. Joshua Watson had always carefully cultivated his friendships, and on the death of Norris writes—

‘Our departed friend was the last link of, to me, an almost golden chain, by which I had been bound for more than half a century. For full that period we have taken sweet counsel together, and I do not know that I can call to mind a single point of difference even in opinion, much less in principle or practice. I bless God that I have been permitted, after the direction of a yet earlier friend, to “keep my friendships in repair,” and that in a degree for which I cannot be sufficiently thankful; but still there must be a void which cannot be filled up on this side of the grave.’—Vol. ii. pp. 289, 290.

While they lived, Dr. Wordsworth, Norris, and Joshua Watson were in the habit of meeting; and the niece who writes the

history of these latter years, speaks of the happy cheerfulness of the old friends, and not less of the spiritual counsel they held together. Of the three, Wordsworth died first in 1846. Norris followed in 1850. Inglis, who kept up a close correspondence, had died in the same year. Van Mildert, who was of older standing, was lost to them in 1836; and Hugh James Rose, in 1839. Sikes of Guilsborough yet earlier. But it is to be marked of all, that only death separated them; and the friendship in each case held on unimpaired in freshness of feeling and constant intercourse to the last, one of the strongest testimonies that can be given to the sincerity and purity of their motives, and how little self interfered in their aims.

Archdeacon John James Watson, one of this same brotherhood, had died in 1839; and a still deeper wound had been inflicted on Joshua Watson than the loss of this beloved brother, in the unexpected death of his daughter, Mrs. Wagner, on occasion of the birth of her second son. It was then that his niece became a second daughter to him, and had thus the privilege of watching over his declining years and drawing a picture of a good man's last days. It is well to die at one's post as some men of great age have done; but where the life has been a busy one it is surely better, and shows a more perfect harmony and acquiescence with the orderings of Providence to withdraw the mind gradually and deliberately from the bustle of business and the stir of action, and to retire for the purposes of a more exact and particular preparation. Joshua Watson never felt himself *necessary* to the cause to which he devoted himself. He was not therefore tempted to the common temptation of a busy temper in old age, to hold office to the last, under the real though perhaps unacknowledged persuasion that an efficient substitute is impossible.

It is to be noticed, that though habitually guarded in his expressions, and from principle little prone to the effusions of talkative religious feeling, his conversations with his niece and other friends at the close of his life are marked by a singular ease and even fervour of language. All the deep truths, all the consolations of religion, were not only in his heart but on his lips. The poetry of his nature, which might not seem to have found appropriate nourishment in his active life, now found free play. He loved to quote from the stores of a tenacious memory the poet Wordsworth, and the 'Christian Year;' and Barrow and Jeremy Taylor were text-books with him. He entered, too, into the lighter reading of the day, and had leisure of mind and freshness of interest to throw himself into fiction, especially where this implied sympathy with the young people about him, and amongst whom he loved to find himself. His niece writes—

'We were reading "Heartsease," and he often seemed the youngest of the party in the keenness of his interest in the characters, and his never-failing recollection of every circumstance of the story.'—Vol. ii. p. 309.

Within a few months of his death he was visited by the Bishop of New Zealand, then in England, and in whose labours he had always taken deep interest.

'A few months later Bishop Selwyn wrote thus of the intercourse which had been permitted him with his aged friend, intercourse of which he said publicly, that if he had gained nothing else by his visit to England, it would have been an ample recompense for the journey:—

"It is no small happiness to me to have been just in time to see him, and to have enjoyed two long and precious interviews, when the setting sun, though just touching the horizon, was still unclouded, and differing only from its former self in the mellowness of its evening light."—Vol. ii. pp. 307, 308.

And the biographer records another testimony to the beauty of this season of her uncle's life, which we quote as coming from one who had not known him in the busy part of it.

'I shall ever look upon it as one of the privileges for which I am deeply thankful, the opportunity of seeing and conversing with Mr. Joshua Watson within the last year at Daventry. I remember so well, as a lad, case-hardening myself against the name of Joshua Watson, which I was continually hearing quoted as a final authority in all Church-matters, and I pictured to myself a hard, dry, impenetrable man, who had no sympathies beyond a committee-room in Pall Mall or at Fulham. I certainly long ago learnt to change this opinion of youthful conceit, but it was a real delight to me to do my inward penance at his own table, and have my former self condemned, and yet, as I felt at the same time absolved, by his unaffected wisdom and piety, his pleasant and even playful conversation, and the zeal with which he entered into the newest and most advanced Church schemes, without a shade of the dogmatizing of old age, or the assumption of an authority which would have been so readily admitted. He seemed still the helper and sympathiser, indeed rather the listener and learner, encouraging instead of damping new projects. A less set and prejudiced man for one of strong fixed principles I never saw, and it was delightful to see the vigorous life of faith and love as fresh as ever within its wasted tabernacle. Excuse me for running on with what must be commonplace home-truths to you, but it revives in me for a while a blessed memory in which I cannot deny myself the pleasure of indulging.'—Vol. ii. pp. 308, 309.

His death took place in January, 1855, in his eighty-fifth year; his last hours cheered by every outward circumstance of tender respect and private affection, and far more by the consolations of an ardent faith and assured hope.

Many traits are given of characteristic liberality and benevolence. His devotion to public institutions had never interfered with his private charities, which seem to have been on a most generous, almost lavish scale. He helped the poor, he assisted indigent friends and relations—allowing many of them regular pensions. Everything constituted a claim. He gave a painted window where his father had gone to school; and remitted a considerable sum to a man because he had once been

his rival in business. He never gave people up or was discouraged by failure—not from want of discernment in himself, but that he held the long-suffering of Providence an example he was bound to follow. His niece, too, has preserved some of his sayings, gathered from confidential conversations, and given as the conclusions of his observations. Not that he aimed at the sententious or oracular, he indeed lived under the fear of egotism and display; but so consistent a career must have been the result of system as well as temperament; and system naturally expresses itself in conclusions. These gleanings from his matured experience prove, as his whole course proves, the mutual relation of thought and action which had always existed in him and prompted his efforts and undertakings. His thought had always tended to immediate practice. His practice never anticipated or ran counter to his deliberate opinion; and with him a well-weighed opinion had the force of a principle, and was acted upon in duty and in faith. It is certain that he impressed all who had to work with him in public affairs, and all who had to do with him in domestic relations, with the sentiment that consistent goodness and virtue must inspire. He was in their eyes, without the large list of reservations and apologies which usually accompany such a testimony, emphatically a good man: Nature and constitution no doubt befriending the fair picture—as exempting him from the temptations that beset brilliant talents and a more sensitive organization. But every temperament has its own temptations, and it was in overcoming these, in a strict obedience to the dictates of conscience, in habitual self-control, and in a diligent cultivation of his powers, in order to devote them to the highest ends, that his character attained its excellence.

ART. III.—*The History of the Jews from the Christian Era to the Dawn of the Reformation.* By PHILIP HENRY GOSSE. London: Printed for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1855.

AT a time when inspiration is called in question, and prophecy denied, it is of no small importance to be able to appeal to living facts to prove the truth of both; and nowhere can we so confidently appeal as to the history of Israel in all its stages, since the uttering of the great prophecy of our Lord (Matt. xxiv.)—which is, in truth, only the last of a long series that had been uttered previously—to the present time. Nay, we may go back to the moment when the great Lawgiver himself, before his people entered on their career of conquest of the Promised Land, foretold to a victorious people, with marvellous exactness, the desolations unparalleled, and almost inconceivable, that have since come upon them (Deut. xxviii.)—a people separate from others in their prosperity, and separate also in their adversity—a perpetual wonder for their preservation in their own land, and equally a wonder for their preservation in those of the stranger. No other people ever has, or ever could have, preserved their existence through the persecutions of seventeen centuries, but one which the Ruler of the world intended to preserve in order to fulfil His own purposes. Whether we look to the East or to the West, to Babylon, Palestine, or Spain, the event proves the truth of prophecy. Tenacity of life is only equalled by tenacity of their religious rites. While other religions have passed away before the conquering Cross, Judaism flourishes still. While other nations, once great, and, in their field of operations, for a time invincible, have vanished, or been absorbed into other peoples, so as to form, out of the amalgamation, one new race, with almost a new language, these have continued unchanged and unchangeable; little trace remains of the Roman of two thousand years ago in the Gothicised Italian of to-day; the irruptions of the northern tribes into the Lower Empire have dissipated the blood of the ancient Greek; Arab conquest has effaced the African Vandal from the country of his adoption; the Mongol hordes in Asia have supplanted the mighty empires of Persia, Assyria, and Babylon. Amid all these changes, the Jew of conquered Palestine remains the same. While the learning and civilization, long inherited and never lost, far surpassing the rude barbarism of the northern conquerors, eminently fitted him for posts of trust and honour in the

governments of the latter, yet the curses written in the law were ever coming upon him to the uttermost, and the blood that he imprecated upon himself at the crucifixion was continually required at his hands by the believers in the Crucified. One day we see the Jew administering, with sagacity and prudence, the finances of a Christian kingdom; on the next we see the decree of an ecclesiastical council demanding his blood or banishment, as an enemy of Christ. One day we see him exercising the noble art of medicine with a knowledge and skill which he had inherited from Eastern sages; on the next we hear a popular cry for his life, on the senseless plea that he had poisoned the wells of the country. The moment that crowned his long-suffering and efforts with success was that which endangered his very life and liberties. We purpose, in the present article, to follow out the history of this remarkable people in one of the most remarkable of its periods, viz. that in which, after the fourth great catastrophe of their race, under the Emperor Hadrian in 135, they again appear in power and importance under their spiritual head, the Patriarchs of the West, and their temporal kings, the Princes of the Captivity, in the East.¹

We cannot help noticing the extraordinary fact, that the most interesting history of this singular people, from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian to that of their final banishment from Spain in the fifteenth century—which may be reckoned as the extinction of their glory,—is so little known, and so slightly attended to, in most compendiums of history. How few among us have read the pages of the diffuse, and not altogether trustworthy, Basnage, or the more accurate Jöst, to say nothing of the laborious Buxtorf. Even Dean Milman, Dr. M'Caul, and Mr. D'Israeli, have failed to excite an interest in what may be called mediæval Judaism, among a people, and at a time, that the greatest interest is manifested in the modern children of Abraham; and yet few histories contain such interesting episodes, and such strange vicissitudes of fortune. As a people, literature and learning had a home among them, and kept their place, when the swarms of northern barbarians, both of Europe and Asia, had overwhelmed both on either continent, or enclosed them within the cells of the convent and the walls of the declining capital of Eastern Rome. No less curious is it to note, that when the Mohammedan conquest of the latter

¹ Let us say here, once for all, that when we speak in this article of the East and West, we are following the Jewish division, and not that which is generally understood in history,—the division of the Roman empire. The East, in Jewish history, is the country east of the Euphrates; the West, all west of that river, including, of course, Palestine and Egypt, as well as Europe and Africa.

caused the revival of letters in the West, by the dispersion of the learned of Constantinople among the courts and universities of Europe—stimulated by the invention of printing—Jewish science declined, excepting in rare and individual instances. It had done its work; it was no more needed: its brightness paled before the rising of the brighter luminaries of the Christian Church.

We propose, then, to take our readers back to the time of the fourth destruction of Jewish Jerusalem, and trace the history of Judaism in Palestine and Babylon to the extinction of independence in both. Hadrian assumed the purple in 117, and soon turned his eyes toward the turbulent and restless inhabitants of Judea: determining to put a stop for ever to the rebellious plans of the ever-plotting Jews, he sent forth an edict that Jerusalem should be razed, and a Roman colony established in its stead, with a temple dedicated to Jupiter on the very spot where that of Jehovah had once stood. Already had the Jews been forbidden to be circumcised, so that the extinction of their race, as a separate people, seemed imminent, or, at least, its absorption into that of the heathen Gentiles that surrounded them. All seemed lost but hope; their history, full of the miraculous deliverances of the Lord, led them to expect that, in their darkest hour, He would interfere to save them: besides, the persuasion hopelessly clung to that the time was at hand when the highest glory of all the kingdoms of the earth was to be theirs,¹ would be only more fondly cherished in their hour of peril.

And it was at that moment that one appeared who proclaimed himself as the Deliverer: he announced himself as the 'Star of Jacob,' and declared that his name was Bar-Cochab, 'the Son of a Star;' he called in aid miraculous powers to attest the truth of his pretensions, fire visibly proceeded from his mouth; his miracles, or his assertions, deluded the Rabbi Akibah, the greatest living authority in the Jewish Law; and he allowed himself, at the age of one hundred and twenty, to be called the Standard-bearer of the Son of the Star. We are not going to give a description of the horrors of that war; Jerusalem fell,² and only the stronghold of Bither³ remained: at length it also was taken, and was given over to the carnage of

¹ 'Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur.'—*Sueton. Vespas. cap. 4—8.*

² 'Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur.'—*Tacit. Hist. lib. v. cap. 9—13.*

³ On the same day, 9th Ab, that Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, and that Titus destroyed it.

⁴ Until the last few years, the site of Bither was unknown; its discovery is due to the Rev. G. Williams, who found a village called Beiter, and near it a rocky eminence well suited for defence. See *Holy City*, Pt. I. ch. iii. pp. 136, 137.

an infuriated soldiery. Fearful stories are told of that massacre: the Rabbins say that more fell there than came out of Egypt with Moses; this is probably an exaggeration. We do know, however, that in that war there perished, according to Roman authority, 580,000 by the sword alone, besides those that died from famine, while an untold number was sold as slaves both in Asia and in Egypt. Jackals and hyenas howled about the empty streets and deserted houses of once populous towns; and desolation alone seemed to hold undisputed sway; to all human calculation the Jewish nation had perished. It was not thus to happen: the remnant of Israel was to be, according to prophecy, 'a sign and a proverb among all nations whither the Lord had scattered them.' Within the short space of sixty years after this event something almost like a resurrection from the dead appeared in the scattered nation, and two regular and powerful governments rose on the ruins of the former. On the quiet shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, in the town of Tiberias, appeared a sort of spiritual despotism—Rosh Abboth, Chief of the Fathers, called, in Greek writers, the Patriarch, to whom the West paid a willing obedience; while, in the East, there arose another, outside the Roman empire, at Babylon, of even greater importance, who is styled 'The Prince of the Captivity.'

Out of the massacre of Bithur only one scholar escaped, Simon, the son of Gamaliel; like the Rabbins and teachers he had to hide himself till the bitter persecution was over; and it was not till the reign of the philosopher, Antoninus Pius, that the schools could be reopened; then Simon was acknowledged president, for he had a sort of hereditary claim to that dignity. At last, after several migrations, Tiberias was chosen as the seat of authority, and there was set up that Jewish Pontificate which, for centuries, was cheerfully acknowledged throughout the whole West; the tribute for the support of his dignity was collected more easily from the Euphrates to the Atlantic than even the taxes for the imperial treasury of Rome. 'Even now,' writes Origen, 'when the Jews are under the dominion of Rome, and pay the didrachm, how great, by the permission of Cæsar, is the power of their ethnarch. I myself have been a witness that it is little less than that of a king. For they secretly pass judgments according to their laws, and some are capitally condemned, not with open and acknowledged authority, but with the connivance of the Emperor. This I have learned, and am fully acquainted with, by long residence in their country.'¹

In every synagogue—and there was a synagogue in every

¹ Quoted by Milman, vol. iii. p. 134.

place where ten men, not altogether employed in secular pursuits (*decem otiosi*), could be found to form a congregation—collection was made for the Patriarch; each year the Patriarch sent his collectors—they are called Apostles, the office was an old one, and employed to designate those who collected tribute for the Temple,—who visited every synagogue, received the tribute, and reported the state of affairs to the Patriarch on their return. Each synagogue, like the mosques in Mohammedan countries at the present day, had its court of judicature as well as its divinity school; a plan convenient, if not necessary, when, as in the Pentateuch and the Khoran, the civil law is identical with the ecclesiastical. Appeals necessarily came to the Patriarch, whose decision was final: hence his great power. In these decisions he was assisted by the Sanhedrim, whose powers were devoutly believed by the Jews to be derived from Moses and the seventy elders that composed the judicial court in the wilderness, and to have been continued by perpetual succession till their own time. We need not stop to refute this, nor even to trace the origin of this body; it is sufficient to say that it came into power after the divine order of prophets had ceased, and the divine oracles of Urim and Thummim had for ever become silent. As long as power remained in Jerusalem, and the sacred ritual was celebrated in the Temple, and the dispersed of Israel came from every part to keep the great feasts, the Sanhedrim found little difficulty in administering the law; but when all this had passed away, and Israel became not a denizen merely in foreign lands, but held there a permanent habitation, when each foreign synagogue became a centre of civil and ecclesiastical law, totally differing from that of the country in which it was, then it became necessary to have some written guide to show the interpretation of the Law, and to record the decisions of the judges: a mass of unwritten precedents might remain as a tradition among the members of the Sanhedrim, but could hardly extend to foreign synagogues. Such a guide was needed, and R. Jehudah Hakkodosh (the Holy), the successor to R. Simon in the Patriarchate, supplied it. He gathered all the traditional decisions, and arranged the most important of them in a volume called the Mishna, or *Repetition*.

This volume was studied by thousands as the only explanation of the Law; learning in the law alone now gave eminence in the Israelitish republic; honours and wealth awaited the successful student. 'The truth is, that Judaism had found its last asylum 'in its numerous academies or colleges, which boasted of a race 'of Mishnaical doctors, residing at different places. A strange 'and wondrous spectacle was now exhibited to the universe. A 'conquered nation had changed their military leaders into

'Rabbins, and their hosts into armies of students. We have 'accounts of pale-cheeked squadrons, covered only with the dust 'of the schools: but where ten or twenty thousand disciples were 'practising their tactics under some able chieftain of the 'traditions.'¹

This treatise, the Mishna, is, in truth, a very crude collection of precedents, some contradictory to each other, many leaving the point in debate doubtful. That inclination, so strongly condemned by our Lord, of paying strict attention to outward observance, and neglecting the weightier matters of the Law, increased in the disputations of the schools. The letter of the Law became the great study, outward observances the chief point in religion; distinctions of clean and unclean, of things that polluted and those that did not, engrossed the attention of the schools, and demanded the gravest judgments of the most learned Rabbins. To clear up these points was the collection of the Mishna made: it treats of all subjects from the ritual of worship down to trivial domestic arrangements. The following is a specimen:—

'§ 3. Leather straps of the Tephilin with the Tephilin [attached thereto] make the hands unclean. R. Simon saith, "The straps of the Tephilin do not make the hands unclean."

'§ 4. The margin in a book of the law, at the top and at the bottom, at the beginning and at the end [thereof] make the hands unclean. R. Jose saith, "[The margin] at the end does not make the hands unclean until the roller be attached to it."

'§ 5. A book [of the Law] in which [the writing] is obliterated, but which still contains eighty-five letters, a number equal to the Parasha, makes the hands unclean. Any Megillah which contains eighty-five letters, [a number] equal to the above-named Parasha, makes the hands unclean. All Sacred Scriptures make the hands unclean. R. Jehudah saith, "Canticles make the hands unclean, but Ecclesiastes is [subject to] dispute [difference of opinion]." R. Jose saith, "Ecclesiastes does not make the hands unclean, but the Canticles are [subject to] dispute." R. Simon saith, "Ecclesiastes is one of [those observances in which] Beth Shammai [are] less strict, and Beth Hillel more rigid." R. Simeon ben Azai said, "I have it as a tradition from the mouths of seventy-two elders, on the day they inducted R. Eleazar ben Azariah into the president's seat, that Canticles and Ecclesiastes [both] make the hands unclean." R. Akivah said, "Mercy forbid! no man in Israel ever disputed that the Canticles make the hands unclean, as the whole [history of the] world does not [offer an epoch] equal to the day, on which the [book] Canticles was given to Israel; for all the Kethoobim [Hagiographers] are holy, but the Canticles are holy of holies." The dispute [in question, therefore,] referred to Ecclesiastes [only]. R. Jochanan ben Joshua, the son of R. Akivah's father-in-law, said, "Even as ben Azai stated, so was the dispute, and so was [also] the decision."²

¹ Genius of Judaism, p. 85.

² Mishna. Treatise Yadaim, ch. iii. This extract is from the Mishna, translated into English—at least, a part of it—by Mr. de Sola, and Mr. Raphell. London, Sherwood and Gilbert, 1843. The portions in brackets are supplied by the translators.

We need scarcely stop a moment to point out how little is really decided on the question in dispute, and how puzzled would be any one who wished to have the point finally settled. Of course, the followers of the School Shammai would take one side, those of Hillel the other—Scotists and Thomists, Franciscans and Dominicans, as it were, by anticipation—only of far more importance than the difference of the latter, since the question of cleanness and uncleanness entered into the very essence of their religion. Naturally, the Mishna needed a comment, as well as the Law; 'at first considered as the perfection of human skill and industry, it was at length discovered to be a vast indigested heap of contradictory decisions. It was a supplement to the Law of Moses, which itself required a supplement. Composed in curt unconnected sentences, such as would occur in conversation, designed to be got by rote by the students from the lips of their oracles, the whole was at length declared not to be even intelligible, and served only to perplex and terrify the scrupulous Hebrew. Such is the nature of "traditions" when they are fairly brought together, and submitted to the eye.

'The Mishna now only served as a text (the Law of Moses being slightly regarded) to call forth interminable expositions. The very sons of the founder of the Mishna set the example, by pretending that they understood what their father meant. The work once begun, it was found difficult to get rid of the workmen. The sons of "The Holy" were succeeded by a long line of other rulers of their divinity schools, under the title, aptly descriptive, of the *Amoraim*, or *dictators*. These were the founders of the new despotism; afterwards, wanderers in the labyrinth they had themselves constructed, roved the *Seburaim*, or *opinionists*, no longer dictating, but inferring opinions by keen disputations. As in the decline of empire, mere florid titles delight, rose the *Geonim*, or *sublime doctors*; till at length, in the dissolution of this dynasty of theologians, they sunk into the familiar titular honour of *Rabbi*, or master.'¹

These commentaries on the Mishna were called the Gemara, or *perfection*; the two together form the Talmud, or *doctrine*. They were commenced by R. Jehudah's disciples, and completed, it is generally supposed, somewhere about the end of the third century: this is known as the Jerusalem Talmud. In it the Mishna, and not the Levitical Law, is the text, of which the Gemara is the interpretation.

This Talmud, however, was far from giving satisfaction: it

¹ D'Israeli, p. 88.

was complained that the style was unpolished, the dialect barbarous, and the authorities quoted were few, many eminent Rabbin being omitted. Perhaps, amid all this, there was some little jealousy in the flourishing schools of Babylon of the now declining power of the Patriarch; it was only right that their Rabbin and their decisions should hold equal place with those of the West. Accordingly, R. Asa, of Sora, undertook the task of the compilation of an enlarged Talmud. Forty years were spent by him in this great work; their close saw the end of his life, but not of his undertaking; his disciples took it up, and the work went on: it is supposed to have been completed about the commencement of the sixth century.¹

The minute attention to the letter, which now more than ever characterized the Rabbinical teaching, almost necessitated the labours of a class of men who should give their whole attention to the preservation of the Scriptures in their literal integrity; a false transcription of a word, nay, even of a letter, might impair the sense, or even destroy the meaning of the inspired writing. To preserve the integrity of the letter became the supreme care of the masters of the schools; they enumerated, registered, and classed the letters of the whole Bible so as to make, from that time forth, mistake almost impossible, or, if made, easy of correction. Thus we are told that in Genesis there are 12 great divisions, 43 chapters, 1,534 verses, 20,713 words, and 781,000 letters. Before the art of printing nothing can be conceived as more valuable for the preservation of the text. The men who did this were called Masorites.

Besides this work there was another which, from the circumstances of the time, was equally necessary, and that was the insertions of the vowel points. As long as the Hebrew was a living language, uncorrupted by the introduction of foreign words, idioms, and phrases, there was little need of this aid; the context would fix the meaning of a doubtful word: but when the exact language of the Bible ceased to be the vernacular, when many new words were in use in the place of old ones become obsolete, every guide was needed: the Masorites, by introducing the vowel points, fixed the meaning of the word, at least, as it was understood in their time. When this was done is still a question among the learned. Basnage quotes a passage

¹ The Jerusalem Talmud has been twice printed—at Venice, in 1523, 1 vol. folio; and at Cracow, 1 vol. fol.

The Babylonian Talmud has been several times printed. Venice, 1520, 12 vols. fol.; Basle, 1581; Amsterdam, 1644; Berlin and Franckfort, 1715, 12 vols. fol. This last is said to be the best edition.

from Jerome, which shows that the points did not exist in his time.¹

The sixth order² of Jewish doctors is the Cabbalists, an order which has exercised a far larger influence than any of the others—an influence which may be said to have created numerous sects of heretics in the early ages of the Church, and to have corrupted many of the orthodox to an inconceivable extent. According to them, Cabbalism has existed from the creation—nay, even before it. In it was contained the mystery of the creation, the fall both of men and angels, and the redemption by the Messiah. God instructed angels into its secrets, and they, in turn, conveyed their knowledge to favoured men: thus, Raziël taught Adam, Jophiel instructed Shem, Raphael Isaac, Metatron Moses, and Michael King David. It culminated in Solomon, who, by it, understood the language of birds, and beasts, as well as those of all nations; nay, his power extended to the realm of spirits, for he commanded the services of demons and fallen angels. Its secrets were traditionary, they had never been committed to writing; inherited by word of mouth, they were augmented by intense study. The first that broke through this rule was R. Simeon Jochaides, the reputed author of the book of Zohar. R. Simeon is said to have lived about the time of the destruction of the Temple by Titus: taking refuge in a cave from persecution, he commenced his work; here he was instructed by frequent visits of the Prophet Elijah, besides a special revelation conveyed to him by means of the words themselves, which fell of their own accord into such an order as to make plain the mysteries they contained. Whether R. Simeon was the author of Zohar, and whether he lived at the time mentioned, is not, perhaps, certain; but that Cabbalism had attained immense influence in the first century, there can be no doubt. The whole system of Gnosticism is

¹ 'En effet, Saint Jérôme (Hieron. in Jerem. xxii.) se trouvant embarrassé sur le mot de *debar*, qui peut avoir différentes Significations, selon la différente Ponctuation, il [sic] remarque que l'embarras naît de ce que les Juifs n'ont point de Voilles, et que chacun explique, selon sa Prudence, la Liaison que ce Terme peut avoir avec ce qui précède, et ce que suit.'—*Basnage, Histoire des Juifs*, liv. iii. chap. ix. § 12. The end of the chapter leaves the date of this introduction of the points in about the same uncertainty as the commencement. It is remarkable that the date of the introduction of accents into Greek is likewise uncertain; it seems to have taken place about the same time as that of Hebrew points, and probably for the like cause, viz. the declension of the language. It is worthy of note, that the Greek accents on proper names in the LXX. generally correspond to those in the Hebrew.

² The six orders are—1. The Tanaites, Doctors; i.e. those who maintained unwritten traditions from Ezra to Jehdah the Holy. 2. The Talmudists. 3. Sebu-reans, or Pyrrhonians, from Sevara, *opinion* Dubitants, because they disputed without coming to a decision. 4. The Gaonim, *sublime* or *excellent*, generally heads of schools. 5. Masorites, from Masora, *tradition*. 6. Cabbalists.

essentially Cabbalistic, and Gnosticism is as certainly Jewish in its origin; the engrafting on this system the revelations of the New Testament was only a development in a particular direction. But, after all, Cabbalism is equally of heathen origin: it is found in all the ancient mysteries, Egyptian, Phœnician, or Grecian; and as such we must regard it. The strange cosmogonies, the generations of Æons, are not to be taken literally: they are merely figures or veils which cover and contain the real doctrine. No doubt the vulgar, the uninitiated, believed all these to be realities; but the initiated penetrated the meaning beneath. This is the very essence of Cabbalism; the letter for the unlearned; but that which lies under the letter, the mystery, for the initiated. Thus, there are three kinds of worlds, represented under the form of three men; all the limbs and parts of these bodies represent the operations of the Divinity: to each of these men is assigned a wife, representing the production of all things:¹ the head, instead of brains containing dew, white and pure as crystal; in the right hand a cross—these two things we shall have to mention afterwards,—as well as the universal appearance of the two principles, the male and female, so clearly agreeing with the great feature of the mysteries of Isis. How all this was developed in the reveries of Valentinus and Basilides, readers of S. Irenæus well know: all are not, however, equally aware that it is from these that the once celebrated Rosicrucians² drew their lore; nor has the fact been yet traced with the accuracy it deserves, that the 'Great Asian Mystery' of the present day is only a remnant of the Jewish Cabbala, or, more probably, of the Gnostic development, engrafted upon the Khoran, as the Gnostics engrafted it on the Gospels. The secret religions of the Druses, the Assassins, the Ansireeh, are the lineal descendants of the Gnostic heresies; they pretend that under the letter of the Khoran there lies a mystical interpretation,³ to which the initiated are led by degrees and steps; the full knowledge of which is pure atheism.

¹ Burckhardt (Travels in Syria, p. 152) asserts that the object of Ismayly worship is the female symbol, and the Ismaylys are reported to mix, on certain days in the year, in promiscuous debauchery.' Mr. Walpole, in his book (*Ansairii Assassins*), gives, at the end of vol. iii. a Latin translation of what he calls a prayer of the Ansireeh, but which really is an Ismaelee prayer, which proves beyond doubt Burckhardt's assertion. Dr. Smith (as quoted in Carl Ritter's *Erdkunde*) says, 'The Ansireeh are not guilty as the Ismaelech of the worship of the goddess of nature.' They seem to use what they worship as a symbol of mother earth.'—*Note in Lyde's 'Asian Mystery,' p. 97.*

² Rosicrucian is derived from *Ros*, dew, and *Cruz*, a cross.

³ Among these secret Mohammedan sects, the esoteric meaning of the Khoran is termed *El-Batin*, the exoteric *Ez-Zahir*; the allegorization is called *Tawzel*, in contradistinction to *Tanzeel* (descent), the literal.

We must now return to the Patriarchate of the West, though it will be only to record its gradual extinction. Its real history is wholly taken up with disputes and discussions in the schools, learned decisions on unimportant matters, of no interest to the general reader. Historians the Jews had none; what we do know comes from other sources, and some of those very imperfect. At the beginning of the fifth century, we find that power fast declining, internal dissensions at the court, and difficulties in raising the tribute in foreign synagogues and among communities which were every day assuming a more independent position in the several countries where they were settled, were rapidly causing the decay of the power of the ecclesiastical head of Western Judaism. We read, too, of strange stories—in Christian authors, for Jewish ones are wholly silent on this point—of Patriarchs suspected of having embraced Christianity. Epiphanius tells us that R. Hillel III. was baptized by a bishop on his death-bed. The Patriarch, we are told, sent for the Bishop of Tiberias under pretence of consulting him as an experienced physician: water was brought by his own servants on the same plea; and when the latter had retired, he received at the hands of the bishop clinic baptism. Joseph, his own physician, found in the house a Hebrew translation of the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. John, and the Acts of the Apostles. He read them, and was converted. Being detected in reading the Gospel of S. John, he was discharged from his office of collector of the revenue, and scourged in the synagogue; afterwards some fanatics of his own nation tried to drown him in the river, but he escaped their hands: we next find him a baptized Christian, high in the favour of the emperor, and count of the empire. The accession of Constantine to the throne and the spread of the new religion—an apostasy from Judaism as the Jews accounted Christianity—which was immensely impelled by the conversion of the Head of the Empire, both contributed to hasten the decay of the power of the Patriarch of the West, and the influence of the Sanhedrim of Tiberias. Laws were passed for the protection of converts from Judaism, and prohibitions against converts to Judaism: the Jewish tribunals were now forbidden to stone or put to death Jewish converts to Christianity; Jews were forbidden to possess Christian slaves—it is clear from these laws that Jews, in common with other nations, enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship. Tribute was becoming every year more difficult to collect; an imperial decree at length prohibited it altogether. From that hour the doom of the Patriarchate was certain, and it finally disappeared in the year 429; Gamaliel III. is the last that bore this title, which had existed through three and a half centuries.

Before the extinction of the Patriarchate one gleam of light illuminated the fortunes of dispersed Israel; its intensity for the moment, and its sudden extinction, only rendering more apparent the utter ruin of the national religion, and the hope of its restoration.

‘Unde altior esset
Casus, et impulsæ præceps immane ruinæ.’

The piety of the Empress Helena had made Jerusalem—the Holy City of the Jews—a very centre of Christian sanctity. Under her guidance arose the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and every place consecrated in the memory of the devout Christian was marked for ever by some imperishable memorial; each of these fast obliterating those of the older religion, with its older traditions. Judaism seemed as if it was to be not only succeeded by, but lost in triumphant Christianity.

‘If, then, the Jews beheld with jealous alarm the rival religion seated on the imperial throne, and the votaries of Jesus clothed in the royal purple; if they felt their condition gradually becoming worse under the statutes of the new emperors; if they dreaded still further aggressions on their prosperity, they must have looked with no secret triumph to the accession of Julian, the apostate from Christianity. Before long their elation was still further excited by a letter written from the Emperor, addressed to “his brother,” the Patriarch, and the commonalty of the Jews. Julian seemed to recognise the unity of God in terms which might satisfy the most zealous follower of Moses. He proceeded to denounce their oppressors; condescended to excuse his brother; annulled the unequal taxes with which they were loaded; and expressed his earnest hope that, on his return from the Persian war, the great designs he had formed for their welfare might be fully accomplished. The temporal as well as the religious policy of Julian advised his conciliation of the Jews. Could they be lured by his splendid promises to embrace his party, the Jews in Mesopotamia would have thrown great weight into his scale in his campaign against the Persians; and, in his design of depressing Christianity, it was important to secure the support of every opposite sect. Probably, with these views, the memorable edict was issued for the rebuilding of the Temple on Mount Moriah, and the restoration of the Jewish worship in its original splendour. The execution of this project was intrusted, while Julian advanced with his ill-fated army to the East, to the care of his favourite, Alypius.

‘The whole Jewish world was in commotion; they crowded

‘from the most distant quarters to be present, and to assist in
‘the great national work. Those who were unable to come
‘envied their more fortunate brethren, and waited in anxious
‘hope for the intelligence that they might again send their
‘offerings, or make their pilgrimage to the Temple of the God
‘of Abraham, in His holy place. Their wealth was poured
‘forth in lavish profusion; and all who were near the spot, and
‘could not contribute so amply, offered their personal exertions:
‘blessed were the hands that toiled in such a work; unworthy
‘was he of the blood of Israel who would not unlock, at such a
‘call, his most secret hoards. Men cheerfully surrendered the
‘hard-won treasures of their avarice; women offered up the
‘ornaments of their vanity. The very tools which were to be
‘employed were, as it were, sanctified by the service, and were
‘made of the most costly materials; some had shovels, mal-
‘lets, baskets of silver; and women were seen carrying rubbish
‘in robes and mantles of silk. Men, blind from the womb,
‘came forward to lend their embarrassing aid; and the aged
‘tottered along the ways, bowed beneath the weight of some
‘burden, which they seemed to acquire new strength to support.
‘The confidence and triumph of the Jews was unbounded;
‘some went so far in their profane adulation as to style Julian
‘the Messiah! The Christians looked on in consternation and
‘amazement. Would the murderers of the Son of God be
‘permitted to rebuild their devoted city, and the Temple arise
‘again from the “abomination of desolation”? Materials had
‘now accumulated from all quarters—some say at the expense
‘of the Emperor; but that is not probable, considering the
‘costly war in which he was engaged. Nor were the Jews
‘wanting in ample resources: timber, stones, lime, burnt brick,
‘clay, were heaped together in abundant quantities. Already
‘was the work commenced; already had they dug down to a
‘considerable depth, and were preparing to lay the foundations,
‘when suddenly flames of fire came bursting from the centre of
‘the hill, accompanied with terrific explosions. The affrighted
‘workmen fled on all sides, and the labours were suspended at
‘once by this unforeseen and awful sign. Other circumstances
‘are said to have accompanied this event: an earthquake shook
‘the hill; flakes of fire, which took the form of crosses, settled
‘on the dresses of the workmen and spectators; and the fire con-
‘sumed even the tools of iron. It was even added that a horse-
‘man was seen careering among the flames; and that the
‘workmen, having fled to a neighbouring church, its doors,
‘fastened by some preternatural force within, refused to admit
‘them. [*Sic* in text.] These, however, may be embellish-
‘ments, and are found only in later and rhetorical writers; but

‘the main fact of the interruption of the work by some extraordinary, and, as it was supposed, preternatural interference, rests on the clear and unsuspicious testimony of the heathen *Ammianus Marcellinus*.’¹

It is said that the news of this failure reached Julian before his death, and helped to draw from him that memorable confession, ‘Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!’

It was reserved for Theodosius to put an end to this power of the Patriarch of the West. He passed an edict which stripped him of his authority by taking away his title and office of Prefect. Gamaliel, who had been accused of erecting synagogues contrary to the imperial laws, was the last of the Patriarchs: his real power had passed away when the tribute was forbidden to be collected from the Western Empire; the abolition of the office easily followed. A new order, that of Primates, succeeded: these seem rather to have been local chiefs of the dispersed Jews in various countries, than true successors of the Patriarch; the spiritual authority devolved into the hands of a Rabbinical aristocracy—an authority which has continued to our own day.

We must now pass to the rival throne of Babylon; here another order of things prevailed: the Patriarchate of Tiberias was essentially an ecclesiastical institution; the Princedom of the captivity of Babylon was rather secular. The Princes claimed—and the claim was admitted by a willing people—to be descendants of the royal house of David; they affected more the pomp of a king than the chair of the doctor. Under them, indeed, flourished the Rabbinical schools of Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha, long rivals, and at last successfully so, of those of Sepphoris and Tiberias in the West: in the former, as we have before mentioned, was completed that imperishable monument of Jewish wisdom and Jewish extravagance—the Babylonian Talmud; but we must ever regard the throne of Babylon as representing to the Jewish mind the power of Solomon, rather than that of the Sanhedrim. To it the Jews fondly applied the prophecy of Jacob, ‘The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until

¹ Milman's *Hist. of Jews*, vol. iii. pp. 181—184. Dean Milman suggests that these prodigies may be attributable to secondary causes; that in digging the foundations, the workmen came upon subterranean vaults, charged with fire-damp; this, igniting, caused the explosion, which arrested the hands of the workmen. This is very ingenious, and quite possible; but why deny the miraculous agency of the First Cause, as the Dean seems to do? He goes even further, for he argues that the miracle was unnecessary, inasmuch as the death of Julian, which immediately followed, would, by itself, have stopped the works. True; but by this line of argument the necessity of miracles at all becomes very questionable.

'Shiloh come.' Even the Patriarch of Tiberias was willing—possibly from a mere patriotic spirit—to accord to his rival the honour he claimed. 'Should the Prince of the Captivity come to Tiberias, I would do him homage,' is reported as having been said by the great Jehudah the Holy. The Talmudists of Babylon went still further, and sought to cast contempt on their brethren of Judea: 'Esra,' they said, 'left the fine flour at Babylon, and took with him only the dregs of the people.' Again: 'All the earth is an impure mass in comparison with Judea; but Judea is a corrupted mass in comparison with Babylon.' Even in the Persian empire there were degrees of pureness: 'Babylon is healthy; Mæson is dead; Media is sick; Persia is dying'—by which they meant that the Babylonian Jews were of pure blood; those of Mæson bastards; those in Media, some pure, many not; in Persia there remained few uncontaminated with foreign alliance.

Removed by locality from the influence of the Roman government, the princes could assume a state and magnificence unknown to the more unfortunate remnant of Israel in the West: the kings of Persia, who were the suzerains of the Princes of the Captivity, willingly permitted them the state of a king, and the independence of the people, in the hope that they would prove their allies in the frequent wars with the great Roman power—anxious to prevent the existence of a hostile nation in the heart of their empire.

Unfortunately, this very *éloignement* of the Jews in the East prevents us from acquiring a full and accurate knowledge of them: historians the Jews had none, not even the more humble office of chronicler; such employment was unworthy of the time and labour of the learned; other nations, they said, confine their literature to mundane matters, we labour in sacred wisdom and the knowledge of God. Among the latter they reckoned the puerilities of the fables in the Babylonian Talmud. Nor does Persia afford us much help; if records there were which could throw light on the history of this most interesting people, they have perished, or are yet to be discovered. Beyond Persia the rest of Eastern Asia lies in impenetrable darkness.¹ In the matter of dates, the Jew can very seldom be trusted; he either considers them as unworthy of accuracy, or

¹ We must make one exception to this in the discovery of a Jewish settlement in China. This colony is doubtless of great antiquity. Milman would refer the commencement to so remote a period as 58 or 75 A.C. Its synagogue was constructed to resemble the Temple, with a Holy of Holies, entered only by the High Priest; when discovered by Father Gozani, a Jesuit missionary, none had heard anything of Christianity. They were employed in agriculture and traffic, and some had even attained the rank of Mandarin.

else he wilfully falsifies them to make them agree with some Cabbalistic calculation, or, what perhaps was more frequent, to make them disagree with the Christian system, so as to escape the arguments of the latter from the prophecies of the Old Testament.

There can be no doubt that under the common name of Jew is to be comprehended the remnant of the captivity of Israel, which lingered, and, if we are to believe Dr. Wolff, still lingers yet, in the places where the Assyrian conquerors placed them. Though esteemed schismatic by their brethren of Judah, we may be sure that a common race, a common hope, a common religion, and, still more, in later times, under the horrors of the great Tatar invasion, a common misfortune, would compel them to make up their differences, and unite as one people. Neither can it be doubted that the latter cause would make many also apostates, and complete the fulfilment of that fearful prophecy, which alone is sufficient to prove the truth of inspiration:—
 ‘And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the
 ‘one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt
 ‘serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have
 ‘known, even wood and stone.’¹

¹ Deut. xxviii. 64. Dr. Wolff, in his last work, gives examples of compliance with heathen religion, if it be not total apostasy. ‘Before we leave Poonah, Wolff must make mention of the *Bené Israel*, i.e. “Children of Israel,” who were resident there, for they are totally distinct from the rest of the Jews in Europe, and Hindostan. After the destruction of the first Temple in Jerusalem, their ancestors went first to Arabia, and then to Hindostan, where they have since forgotten their law; but they continue to repeat, in Hebrew, certain prayers which they have learned from other Jews . . . They serve the English as volunteers, in their armies, and are esteemed the best native soldiers. They possess great simplicity and honesty of character, and are faithful to their wives, and, by far, more moral than the Jews of Cochin. [*Sic.*] They keep in their houses idols of wood and stone, and thus the prophecy is fulfilled, “And then ye shall serve other gods, even of wood and stone.”—Wolff, vol. ii. p. 233. ‘At last, Wolff arrived at Mished, the capital of Khorassan. Here he stayed with a Jew, the most respectable of them, Mullah-Mehder by name, in whose house Wolff had lived fourteen years before, and where he was treated in a very gentlemanly manner. Wolff asked, “How are the Jews at Meshed going on?” To his greatest horror, he learned that the whole community had become Mohammedan.’—*Ibid.* pp. 373, 374. This apostasy was in consequence of a fanatical onslaught of the Mohammedans, who, incited by a *Sayid*, or prophet, believed that the Jews had killed a dog in derision of their religion. They were offered the choice of death or conversion: they chose the latter.

‘The Jews in Bokhara, which do not call themselves Jews, but children of Israel, and who assert that they belong to the ten tribes, say that those Kapi Seeahpoosh are their brethren, whose ancestors had entirely forgotten their law, and had fallen to idolatry—but into the ancient idolatry. They call God, “Imrah,” and they worship the figure of a fish, called “Dagon.” They have in their mountains the ten commandments written upon stone; and their women observe the law of purification.’—Vol. ii. p. 37. ‘There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Jews in Khorassan, Bokhara, Samarcand, and Balk, and also in Shahr-sabz, as well as the descendants of Tchingis Khan, and the Nogay Tatars, and those called of the tribe of Naphtali, are all remnants of the ten tribes. This is not

Over this united people, by the permission of the Kings of Persia, was established that singular *imperium in imperio*, the rule of the Princes of the Captivity. The oriental mind, which ever glories in pomp and display, and esteems the greatness of the people to be in proportion with the distance between themselves and their monarch, had invented a ceremonial for the installation of their prince, which might rival the magnificence of Solomon, who was the type of all greatness and glory in the eye of the Jew. We give the following account from Basnage :—

‘The Princes of the Captivity were installed with much pomp and ceremony. For this purpose the heads of the neighbouring schools, the senators, and the people, gathered in crowds to the city of Babylon. An assembly was formed, and the prince, whom they believed to be of the lineage of David, was seated on a kind of throne; then the head of the School of Sora exhorted him not to abuse his power, and represented to him that he was called to a state of captivity rather than to an empire, because of the sad condition of the people. On the following Thursday the heads of schools laid their hands on him in the synagogue, accompanied by the blast of trumpets, and the acclamations of the people. The latter, after conducting him to his palace in procession, brought him rich presents. On Saturday morning all the personages of distinction assembled at his palace; he placed himself at their head, and, departing from his house, with a veil of silk over his face, proceeded to the synagogue, followed by a vast crowd, while the heads of the schools and the singers chanted hymns and benedictions before his throne. Then was brought to him the Book of the Law, of which he read the first line; after this he made an oration to the people, with his eyes closed out of respect. Should he not be able to do this the head of the school supplied his place. He enlarged, above all things, on charity to the scholars, himself setting the example by bestowing large alms; the rest immediately followed his example. The ceremony concluded by the acclamations of the people, and prayers to God that deliverance might be brought to the nation under his reign. He then gave the benediction, and prayed particularly for each province that God would protect it from pestilence and war; the rest of the prayer was said in a low voice, so as not to reach the ears of any, lest his words might be repeated to his suzerain or other kings, for he prayed that the kingdom of the Jews might rise on the ruins of other monarchies. Coming

an hypothesis, but a relation of their own assertions. As to the Kafir Seeahpoosh, Wolff strongly suspects them to be the same; but he cannot prove it, as he never heard it asserted by the Seeahpoosh themselves.’—*Ibid.* p. 62.

out of the synagogue, he was again conducted with great ceremony to his palace, where he made a feast to the great men of the nation. From this time he never went out except on visits of ceremony to the schools, when a great crowd accompanied him, and all rose up to receive him; and on those occasions when he went to pay his respects to the suzerain of Babylon [Baghdad]. Again, as before, this affair was one of great magnificence. The king, being informed of his intention, sent him his own chariot; the prince of the captivity did not dare to accept the offer, but caused it to advance before him, as a mark of his respect and dependence. He was arrayed in a magnificent robe of cloth of gold, fifty guards marched before him; all who met him made it a matter of duty to follow him to the palace. There eunuchs received him, and conducted him to the throne, while his officers scattered gold and silver around. Approaching the throne he prostrated himself on the earth, to show that he was a vassal and a subject; the eunuchs lifted him up, and placed him on a seat on the left of the king. After the first salutation the prince laid before his suzerain the grievances and the state of affairs of his people, for the latter to redress.¹

The Resch-Glutha, or Prince of the Captivity, held his court with true oriental magnificence; we read of satraps, councillors, and cup-bearers. The Jews of the East were many of them wealthy, they were merchants and artisans, as well as followers of their ancestral employment of husbandmen and shepherds; and no doubt willingly paid their taxes to keep up the glory of their prince. Their great pride was, however, in the schools of learning; the fame of those of Sepphoris and Tiberias in the West only stimulated the schools of Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha, to a generous rivalry. This *imperium* lasted till the eleventh century: in the twelfth a mere *nominis umbra*, a Jew who called himself the Prince, without any royal power, was found by Benjamin of Tudela, when he visited Baghdad; the irruption of the Mongul conquerors, the dissolution of the Persian monarchy, and the revolutions caused by the Mohammedan wars, swept away the *imperium* of the Resch-Glutha, as they did those of greater and stronger monarchs. Yet with a pertinacity peculiarly Jewish, and an unchangeableness essentially oriental, the title is still retained to this day.²

We are not to suppose, however, that the sun shone upon the Princes of the Captivity during this time without a cloud, or

¹ Basnage, Liv. iii. chap. 4, § 7. The above is a free translation.

² 'The Jews are mighty and rich in Bagdad, and many are learned among them, and their great man has still the title, "The Prince of Captivity."'—Wolff, vol. i. p. 327.

that he ever found his suzerain so compliant : from the death of R. Asche, who commenced the Babylonian Talmud, the days of the children of the captivity were indeed dark. The race of Persian monarchs from Izdigerdes to Kobad (430 to 530) were Magians, and persecutors both of Jew and Christian ; sabbath and Lord's-day were alike prohibited, though the schools were still open. In the midst of this external violence, internal strife prevailed ; the heads of the schools would not endure that the Prince, though acknowledged to be of the House of David, should interpret the Talmud in the presence of the Rabbin. Huna, the Resch-Glutha, presumed to do this : R. Chanina, master of the schools, and Huna's father-in-law, forbid him : Huna privately insulted Chanina, and publicly interdicted his subjects from receiving him, or supplying him with the necessaries of life. Chanina prayed in secret, and it seemed as if his prayers were heard, for a pestilence carried off every living member of the royal line, leaving only his pregnant daughter. The history, or legend, goes on to say that Chanina dreamed that he stood in a garden, where he had cut down all the cedar trees, one small sapling alone remaining : on awaking, he believed the dream to signify that he had caused the destruction of David's line, and that it was his remaining duty to tend the unborn infant : day and night he watched at his daughter's door, till the child was born, which, from that hour, became the sole object of his care and thought. In due time, the young Zutra succeeded to his father's honours ; his reign was short ; an impostor, named Meir, brought it to an untimely end. Most probably pretending to be the Messiah, he gathered a band of four hundred men, and devastated the country, giving out that a fiery pillar preceded his march : the Persian monarch Kobad soon quelled the insurrection, and took fearful vengeance on the unhappy children of the captivity ; Zutra and Chanina were hanged, and the Jews dispersed. A son of the former fled to Tiberias, when he renewed the Semicha, or laying on of hands. The Jews of the East made peace with the Persian monarch, and tried to persuade him into war with the Roman empire by a promise of fifty thousand troops as a contingent, and the plunder of Christian Jerusalem. Wars, insurrections, conspiracies, succeeded each other, in which the Jews seemed always destined to be on the losing side, and to suffer the extremities of unsuccessful war. If there was a struggle for the throne of Persia, they took the part of the defeated candidate ; if an insurrection was planned, they lost all by impatiently anticipating the right moment for rising, thus leaving themselves to the easy vengeance of the successful power. Once, indeed, they did possess the ever-coveted capital of their forefathers, under the protection of

their Persian allies, with full permission to work their will there: every church was demolished, the glorious building of Helena and Constantine, including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, given over to the flames: 'the devout offerings of three hundred years were rifled in one sacrilegious day: ' it is said that ninety thousand Christians suffered death, most of them in cold blood. Their triumph was short; the Emperor Heraclius marched to the relief of the Holy City; the old decrees of Hadrian were put in force; the Christians called upon the emperor to make atonement in Jewish blood, while he gladly restored the churches and buildings of the recovered city in more than former magnificence. Arabian conquests, however, soon changed equally the fortunes of Jew and Christian; the Holy City, coveted alike by either, was soon lost to both; the Crescent supplanted the Cross, and on the razed site of the Temple was erected the Mosque of Omar.

We should not be completing our sketch of the history of the Jews in the East were we to pass over in silence the great question of the Ten Tribes: we need not remind our readers of the many solutions that have been given to this historical crux, in which almost every peculiar nation, from the Anglo-Saxon down to the wandering gipsy, has been claimed for the remnant of Israel. Basnage mentions the theories of his time of the Israelitish origin of the Tatars and Red Indians; we need not say that a more correct knowledge of the races of mankind has long ago exploded these notions. At the present day the Affghans are claimed by some, while Dr. Wolff would assign the honour to the Nestorians of Persia. We are afraid that we must say that all these claims seem to us to rest upon very little foundation; few of those who have been so ready with their conjectures have really qualified themselves for a judgment on the point by investigating in a calm and impartial manner—perhaps not in any manner at all—the history of Israel since its dispersion; and yet, without such investigation, every conjecture must be utterly baseless. How few, *e.g.* have studied even Basnage, or Buxtorf, or Jöst, to say nothing of Josephus and the Talmudists. Dean Milman, though he evidently had Basnage lying before him when writing his history, does not enter into any discussion on the question; while others entertain the question, or rather entertain us with their wild guesses, without any competent knowledge of the subject. How often we are told, for instance, that the Samaritans of our Lord's time were descendants of the Ten Tribes, instead of being those of the heathen nations introduced by Shalmaneser; how completely is the address of the Epistle of S. James, 'to the twelve tribes scattered abroad,' ignored, and such casual notices as that

of S. Paul (Acts xxvi. 7), 'our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night;' and again (S. Luke ii. 36), 'Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser,' overlooked. We intend to give, at the sacrifice of all mystery, our reasons for supposing, as we have casually mentioned above, that the Ten Tribes have been long ago incorporated into the remnant of Judah and Benjamin, and included in the common name of 'Jews.'¹ On this point the Talmudists are agreed; the passage we quoted about the corruption of Jewish blood in the phrase 'Mæson is dead, Media is sick, Persia is dying,' referred quite as much to marriages with the Ten Tribes as with heathen.

The Israelites were placed by the king of Assyria 'in Halah and Habor, by the river of Gozan, in the cities of the Medes.' The Talmudists inform us that in their day Halah is Halvaoth; Habor is Adiabene; the river Gozan is Ginzak. Ptolemy speaks of Chaboras, Chalatis, and Ganzanitis; there is little difficulty in identifying these names. Again, we have in the Talmud directions about marriage, 'provision is made concerning espousals, that they contract not with any of the ten tribes.' Again, we read in Ezra (ii. 64), that only forty-two thousand three hundred and threescore returned to Jerusalem; of those only about thirty thousand are reckoned by families; perhaps the other ten thousand were of the ten tribes. Again, it is not quite clear that the whole of Galilee was carried captive by Shalmaneser to an equal extent with Samaria. The application of the prophecy (S. Matt. iv. 14), 'The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people that sat in darkness have seen great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up,' would hardly be applicable, unless a remnant at least of those tribes remained there. Further, when King Josiah restored

¹ 'The making of seventy-two elders to be sent to Alexandria from Jerusalem on this occasion [the translation of the LXX.], and these to be chosen by six out of every tribe, by the advice of Demetrius Phalereus, all looks like a Jewish invention, framed with respect to the Jewish sanhedrim, and the number of the twelve tribes of Israel; it not being likely that Demetrius, an heathen Greek, should know anything of their twelve tribes, or of the number of the seventy-two elders, of which their sanhedrim did consist. *The names of Israel, and of the twelve tribes, were then absorbed in that of the Jews, and few knew of them in that age by any other appellation.* Although some of the other tribes joined themselves to the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity, as I have before observed, and these by the names of those tribes might still be preserved among their descendants, yet it is not to be supposed that all were so; but that some of the names of those other tribes were wholly lost, and no more in being in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and that, therefore, no such choice could then be made out of them for the composing of this version.'—*Prideaux's Connexion*, Pt. ii. Book I. pp. 51, 52.

the religion of Judah, he extended his reformation to the extinct kingdom of Israel, showing pretty clearly that a large number of Israelites still inhabited that country, and that he was permitted by its suzerain to exercise a certain control over the inhabitants.¹

From all these premisses, we think we may fairly draw the following conclusions; that a large number of the ten tribes remained in the northern parts of the ancient kingdom of Israel, after the captivity of Shalmaneser, whose descendants were known as 'Galileans' in the Gospel history, and that the southern part only, viz. Samaria, was settled by strangers from the East; that a considerable number—perhaps about ten thousand—returned with Ezra from Babylon; for these it was, as well as the Galileans, that Ezra offered 'twelve bullocks for all Israel' (viii. 35); that another large portion remains to this day in the places to which they were carried captive, and are known under the general title of 'Jews.' Maimonides confesses that in his time all distinction of tribe and family had been lost.² We must also give some credence to the conjecture of Lightfoot, viz., that a considerable body of these were converted to Christianity by the preaching of the Apostles;

¹ But now, if the seats, cities, countries, of the ten tribes in the times of the Talmudists, were so well known, much more were they so in the times of the Apostles; which were not so far removed from their first captivity. That people, therefore, skulked not [*latuit*] in I know not what unknown land (a thing now conceived of them), but that the preaching of the Apostles came also to them, as well as to other nations. One may say this with the greatest assurance, upon the credit of S. James, who writes his Epistle to the whole twelve tribes,—and also upon the credit of the Apocalyptic, in whom the twelve tribes are sealed, chap. vii. And the words of our Saviour argue the same thing respecting the twelve apostles, that were to judge the twelve tribes, implying, that they all twelve heard the sound of the Gospel, concerning the reception or rejection of which that judgment was to be.

² Under this notion, unless I am much mistaken, is the apostle to be understood treating of the calling of Israel, Rom. xi.; not of the Jews only, but of the whole twelve tribes of Israel, δωδεκαφύλου. And this is that mystery, concerning which he speaks at ver. 25, namely, that hardness, or "blindness happened to Israel ἀπὸ μέρους, by parts, or separately;" first, the ten tribes were blinded,—some hundreds of years after, the two tribes; and both the one and the other remained under that state, until the fulness of the Gentiles came in, when the Gospel entered, and "so all Israel," δωδεκάφυλος, "the whole twelve tribes," namely, they who were the λείμμα, "the remnant," κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, "according to the election of grace," ver. 1, were saved. . . . And so (which is a great mystery), first, the Gentiles were blinded; and, after them, the ten tribes were blinded; and, after them, the two tribes were blinded; all lying under that miserable condition, until all at last were enlightened by the Gospel, and closed together in one body. And that the apostle spake of his own times when the Gospel was newly brought to the Gentiles, he himself sufficiently ratifies and makes known by those words, Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, "At this present time," ver. 5.—*Lightfoot, Talmudical Exercitations on the First Ep. to Cor.*

² Hinc Familiæ inter se confuse sunt, ita ut dignosci nequeant inter se, nec e locis ipsorum cognosci.—*Maimon. De Lotione Manuum, c. iv. § 4.*

perhaps that the greater part of the Oriental Christians in the first century was composed of converted Jews and Israelites; that they, in successive generations, lost their peculiarities of race and feature, through intermarriage and abandoning of peculiar customs. Perhaps there may be some truth in Dr. Wolff's conjecture of the Israelitish origin of the Persian Nestorians; and finally, that a great number adopted the idolatry of the countries in which they lived, and have lost their nationality; that a fearful destruction of them took place under the Tatar invaders.

We have confined ourselves strictly to the limits allowed by the title of this article, and have omitted much connected with the history of dispersed Israel of exceeding interest—*e.g.* the Platonic development in Alexandria; the Homeritic kingdom in Arabia; and the doubtful one of Kozar. The first is worthy of an article by itself; for the second, we must refer our readers to Gibbon and Milman; for the last, to Basnage.

ART. IV.—*Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* By W. F. HOOK, D.D. Dean of Chichester. Vol. I. Anglo-Saxon Period. London: Bentley.

THIS volume, its able author tells us, 'comprises the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church.' It would have been a more acceptable gift to English Churchmen had it really done so. To have to piece out our knowledge of the *origines* of our own Church from Southey and Inett and Soames and Lingard,—from the sparkling points made by an essayist, or the flat pages of the dullest of chroniclers who has not even the merit of knowing facts, or the polemics of a controversialist, or the disquisitions, however large-minded, of a Roman Catholic,—is a state of things not creditable to our Church literature. And few tasks could have better occupied the Dean of Chichester, than to use the well-earned leisure that crowns the noblest of practical lives, in tracing the growth of that English Christianity, the sturdy strength of which he has himself under God done so much in these latter days to renew. The subtle unravelling of metaphysical controversies is not in Dr. Hook's line. And to trace the process of compacting the Papacy out of the Latinized European Churches, has been the larger task of the leisure of another English Dean. It would have been a work most interesting to English Churchmen, and most congenial to all the antecedents of Dr. Hook, to depict the growth of the most unmetaphysical and most un-Latinized of Churches, the Church not of subtle controversy but of practical work, the Church which of all was most truly a national Church, and that Church our own. Here, and here only, the older Britannico-Roman Church organization was swept away from its foundations. And the Italian graft did not take kindly to the oak in which it was grafted, and was quickly overpowered. And the terrors of a journey through Frank-land or the Alps, and the un-Latinized Anglo-Saxon tongue, and the absence of all elements whatsoever of the old Roman Empire, kept foreign influences of all kinds practically apart; and reduced to a sentiment, the more strong because its strength was almost never tested, the romantic, childlike, and happily ignorant reverence felt by the Anglo-Saxon towards the distant and civilised and apostolical mother Church of Rome. And the Church of our forefathers accordingly grew from its own roots, a Church beyond all others national. And that Church was also emphatically the Missionary Church of the time. What the Scot did in the sixth and seventh centuries, was the work of the Anglo-Saxon in the eighth. Mission work was his special work. Where he planted the Gospel,

it took root and lasted. And as abroad, so at home, it was a Church of specially practical and pastoral labour. The *parochia* (in the final and narrowest sense of the word) of Churches across the water was significantly the 'shriftshire' of our own. And the parish priest with his parish church dates from days as early as those of Theodore. And though the formal words of Baptism and of the Mass were only explained and not translated (as Lappenberg seems to think), and the Council of Cloveshoo under Cuthbert only regretted without altering the chanting of psalms in an unknown tongue; yet the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, and the words of promise in the Marriage Service, and perhaps some other things were in the vernacular, and the two first were enforced as a necessary knowledge on all; and Saxon sermons were preached every Sunday; and prose and verse Psalms and the Gospels in Saxon were as familiar as in the days of MSS. they could be; and the Lord's-day was kept, or ordered to be kept, much after the English ideal of the present day. And the system of the Penitentials, which, though we may well doubt the wisdom of the means adopted, was yet the first grand attempt to realise systematically through pastoral care the Christian life throughout the flock, did not indeed arise, but received its first great development in the Church of our Saxon fathers. Add to this the characteristic Saxon pilgrimages, linking us with Rome, with Jerusalem, and even in the ninth century with India, and importing in return the learning and refinement of foreign lands: and the singular fervour of devotion, which counts so unparalleled a beadroll of Saxon kings and queens and nobles, not among the founders only, but among the devoted and world-renouncing monks of ascetic monasteries: and the later religious guilds and brotherhoods, framed no doubt after the doctrine of the day, but indicating a real and devotional Christian feeling; and the pre-eminent learning and piety of the Northumbrian Church above all, with its Cuthbert and John of Beverley, its Bedes and Alcuins and Egberts, showing its vitality even in the day of its captivity, in the romantic and touching faith of the bearers of S. Cuthbert's corpse. Surely here is a subject, which with the flood of light poured upon it by recent antiquarian labours (still, however, sadly incomplete and imperfect), would well repay the historian's toil. And who better than Dr. Hook (if he will but get up his facts) to describe a Church, into the spirit of which he can so largely enter, and whose life and tone his peculiar experience and kindred feeling will so truly appreciate and understand?

However, we must be thankful for what we have, if Dr. Hook will give us no more. He has chosen to limit himself to a single and narrow side-view as it were of this larger subject.

He has tied himself to a line of official biographies; and must needs follow where they lead him, even though they turn him aside from flowery meads to barren sands, or whirl him like a railroad along their own unswerving line, now and then indeed to a glorious prospect from some lofty embankment, but too commonly along a blind cutting, or by the backs of the suburbs of the cities which he passes, instead of to the busy marts and palaces which are the centres of their real life. No doubt our Saxon line of primates contains its fair sprinkling of great names. There are, it must be owned, to set against them, Tatwines and Bregwines in the list, of whom like the Moores and the Herrings of a later date we have to remind ourselves by the help of Mr. Stubbs's '*Registrum Anglicanum*,' that they did once inhabit respectively their monastic or palatial homes of Canterbury or Lambeth. And the ingenuity with which Dr. Hook has devised an agreeable digression to hang upon such barren pegs is amusing. But for the most part our Archbishops were at least men who lived a life worth telling. On the other hand, they were rarely the leading men of the time. Our objection to the plan of such biographies—and they threaten to become common, since Lord Campbell set the fashion,—is that they take us only now and then to the real moving spring of events, while commonly they are compelled to make some secondary, though we own usually interesting, person the principal figure in the picture, and to tell us only by the bye what we chiefly care to know. The life of Dunstan, which Dr. Hook has treated in the noblest spirit, and perhaps that of Augustine, are almost the only periods throughout the volume in which things fall naturally into their right position, and where Dr. Hook's point of view coincides with that which an unfettered historian would take. That of Theodore, which can alone claim to be parallel with these, divides its interest with the contemporary and more brilliant and erratic career of Wilfrid, and the latter is unhappily spoiled in Dr. Hook's pages by a singular and inexcusable ignorance of the common facts of the history itself. But take Alfred's reign, and how exceedingly is the story marred and mutilated by the unavoidable disproportion with which it is here treated! Who ever heard of Ethelred, or who but an editor of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of Plegmund, as having any appreciable share in the truly English reforms, which Alfred (and if any one beside him, Aser) originated and accomplished? Yet it is Ethelred and Plegmund to whom Dr. Hook is compelled to refer his narrative. And except in these three periods,—those of Theodore, Alfred, and Dunstan,—our archbishops present a series of good men, above rather than below the average bishop, yet rarely taking the lead in works of

more vital interest than the securing the privileges of their archiepiscopate, or the giving a triumph to one or other of two rival monasteries through the contingent advantages of possessing their graves.

In truth the accident which gave Canterbury the primacy, did not preserve to it in Saxon times the real or continued leadership of the English Church. Canterbury schools and Canterbury plain song were in repute in England only so long as Italian refinement had still something to impart to Saxon ignorance. And Egbert's school at York speedily superseded the former; while Wilfrid's boasted improvements in the antiphonal chant, and Aldhelm's nationalizing of church music, eclipsed the latter. And Glastonbury, again, was the great school of later times. The monastic life drew its inspiration from Lindisfarne, or from Wilfrid at Ripon, or from Malmesbury and Glastonbury, but not until Dunstan's time from Canterbury. The monastery of Ripon, again, under the same Wilfrid, originated the spirit of missionary enterprise, and the Wessex monasteries supplied a Boniface to improve upon the lesson; but though the latter sought Archbishop Brihtwald's blessing, he took with him the commendatory letters of his own Wessex Bishop, and looked to him for guidance in the instruction of his heathen converts. And the curious letter of the Bishop of London of the same date, in the Appendix to Smith's *Bede*, discloses a very disjointed condition of the southern province, and little submission to Canterbury. The Lichfield schism followed at no long interval. And it was not until the Danes had wasted the Northumbrian Church, and Athelstan had made England one kingdom, that even a technical primacy over the whole country was yielded without dispute to the Southern Kentish See, to be disputed yet again in Norman times, and settled at length and for ever by the efforts of Lanfranc.

A series of well written biographies, however,—to turn from Dr. Hook's choice of subject to his treatment of it,—is always an amusing book, though it is not a history. Anecdote and personal adventure come home to every one. And biographies written with the humour, the weighty sense, and the large and generous spirit of Dr. Hook, and dealing with a state of society at once sufficiently akin and sufficiently alien to our own to awaken both sympathy and curiosity, form a volume that reads in many parts like a novel for interest. And if to understand the men of our own time be a condition of writing sensibly the history of those who lived before us—or if, again, to have taken a manly and vigorous part in existing controversies prepare the mind most thoroughly for a just and equitable estimate of both sides in those that are past—or if a large spiritual experience

be specially helpful to keep a Church historian awake to the hidden stream of the inner Christian life, and to teach him to detect its signs under the ritual, or the æsthetics, or the politics, or the worldly fortunes of the Church, however obscured by them, or however alien to modern habits of thought—or if, once more, a mind trained by action rather than by study, and versed in men rather than books, be apt to be specially ready with comparisons, grotesque or weighty, but in either case vivid, and with trains of thought that link the new to the old, and give life to the latter by bringing them at once to the range of our own experience ;—all these qualifications the greatest among our pastoral clergy assuredly has, and his book bears traces of them in every page. He lacks indeed one qualification, necessary perhaps to the highest class of biography—an enthusiastic admiration of his heroes. His tone towards the Anglo-Saxon Church is a curious compound of candour and contempt—of candour, intentional, deliberate, self-reminding, which covers an involuntary and for ever self-rebuking contempt. His book is almost an expansion of the thesis, the formal propounding of which occupies its earliest pages:—that, while everybody knows and nobody can deny how utterly unenlightened our forefathers were, yet for all that the nineteenth century would be wise not to throw stones. Strip accident from essentials, and judge men from their own point of view, and there is not so much to choose after all, he tells us, in the greater matters of intellect, morals, or religion, between the dark ages and our own. And this candour has both an apologetic and a satirical side, and both double-edged. He is so alive to the foibles of the present age, and so determined to be fair towards those of the past, as to let slip no opportunity of an innocently suggested parallel, by which both are placed on a level, and contemptuous modern readers are left in the dilemma of acquitting or condemning their ignorant forefathers as they please, but in either case of dealing a like measure to themselves. A modern revivalist is thus let in for a defence, *volens volens*, of mediæval belief in still continued miracles. And Dunstan's alleged ventriloquist tricks are most ingeniously sheltered under a parallel with anonymous letters in the *Times* or elsewhere. And the wise man and the mesmerizer are exhibited to rebuke the contemptuous sneer on the face of the enlightened reader at the recourse for the like reasons in older times to the relics and graves of saints. And the idleness of the Canterbury students are excused by modern University example, and serves (*proh pudor!*) as a peg whereon to hang in Dr. Hook's own person a defence of University fox-hunting! The result, however, is a most amusing narrative, written in a piquant style, and yet by no means wanting in the

serious thought and reverent tone befitting its main subject. Dr. Hook indeed has a knack of visibly realising the past to his readers. He is apt at such happy allusions, as the comparison of a Saxon royal palace to the camp at Aldershot, or as when the longs and shorts of Aldhelm, or the young noblemen at Glastonbury, wake us up to quaint imaginations of an Anglo-Saxon Eton. While a lively style only sets off in his pages those higher intellectual and moral qualifications of an historian for which this volume establishes a high claim.

It is a duty which may not be left undone to accompany this praise by a remark of a different kind. Unhappily, Dr. Hook, with all these loftier powers, is deficient in certain lower historical qualities. It would not be fair, indeed, to treat his work as that of an original investigator. His aim apparently has been simply to use the materials which are now readily accessible, in order to popularize them into an interesting volume, which should teach men, in a fair and religious spirit, what the beginnings of the English Church really were. He does not enter, accordingly, into disputed or complicated questions of fact. He is content with assuming, for instance, that Augustine really went to Arles for consecration, or that he died when Wharton says he did. Nor will he settle where he landed, or what was the locality of the conference of the oak. The Welshman will look in vain in his pages for a defence, or even for a bare mention, of Dineth's antedated zeal against a papal supremacy that was not claimed. And so throughout his work. One little bit of an unexplained itinerary of Archbishop Siric, hitherto unpublished, is, we believe, Dr. Hook's entire contribution to the facts and authorities of Saxon Church history. So far we do not complain that Dr. Hook has contented himself with breathing life and character into materials of other people's collecting, without any extreme research towards supplementing or correcting them; but we are constrained to say that he is by no means exact in representing even the authorities which he had before his eyes. In the effort to frame a living picture out of the details of the chroniclers, he is guilty both of frequent inadvertencies in matters of fact, and of imputing motives and asserting explanations without adequate support in his original authorities. The utter confusion which he has made of the history of Wilfrid and Deusdedit is perhaps the most serious case of the first kind. Benedict Biscop's nationality is of less importance, but might as well be right as wrong. He was an Angle, not a Briton. M. Schrödl, we fear, will insinuate worse things of the mention of wine as well as bread,¹ in the story of Mellitus and the pagan

¹ M. Schrödl overlooks the epithet *nitidus* in the farfetched argument for communion in one kind which he founds (or borrows) on this passage. It was some-

sons of Sabert. And the translation of Aldfrith's final reply to Wilfrid in 704, is worse still. Dr. Hook's rendering implies that the *ut dicitis*, 'as you call it,' applied to the epithet 'apostolic see,' instead of to the letter produced by Wilfrid, and asserted by him to be from the apostolic see; and it omits the contrast drawn between the Archbishop sent by the Pope, and the letter brought from the Pope—one though not the main point of the reply turning on the superiority of the more indisputable genuineness of the living messenger as compared with the written message. We could add a great many, too many more of similar slips. The statement that Cuthbert prompted the letter of Boniface to king Æthelbald, or that he agreed with Boniface¹ in desiring to make the see of Rome the centre of unity; or, in an earlier narrative, that Redwald had invited the Canterbury missionaries to his court; or, again, nearly all of the speculations attributed to Wilfrid, or others about him, respecting the see of Canterbury, are specimens of the latter class. The former are, of course, indefensible. With respect to the latter, it may be difficult to draw a line in the mode of statement between the rationale of facts as actually stated by original witnesses, and the allowable framework which all historians must devise to combine and account for them. But surely it falls beyond this line, when conjectural interpretations of the modern thinker are stated as though they were simple assertions of the original witness. And of this it is that we hold Dr. Hook too often guilty. He possesses many of the higher powers that go to make a great historian. May we be forgiven for reminding him that the foundation ought to come before the building, and that reflections, however profound, lose credit in direct proportion to their profoundness, when, unhappily, that to which they refer turns out to have no existence. We cannot forbear asking—that we may conclude in good humour our unavoidable notice of an unpleasant topic, whether the Dean of Chichester, in his cathedral, or in his private oratory, actually keeps S. Gregory's and S. Augustine's days with a special service as old as A.D. 747 or thereabouts; and if so, whether he would favour us with an inspection of so scarce a liturgical document? Our 'present Prayer-books,' he tells us, have festivals in honour of these two saints, after the fashion established in Cuthbert's synod of Cloveshoo. Really, we have been in sad ignorance.

thing in the bread, not in the wine, that attracted the eye of the heathen princes. But Dr. Hook should not have slipped in an express mention of wine which Bede says nothing about.

¹ Why does Dr. Hook call the Council of which Boniface transmits the decrees to Cuthbert, a Council of *Soissons*? It was somewhere in Germany, no one knows where. But at Soissons assuredly it was not. It was held under Carloman, and therefore in Austrasia.

We begin to fear that Mr. Fisher may have had some shadow of reason, after all, for what we have hitherto regarded (nay, do still regard) as disingenuous on his part to the degree of dishonesty—namely, his implied assertion that English Churchmen, or some of them, keep, not indeed these two, but another of the black letter days, that, if we remember right, of S. Margaret.

Space would not allow us to follow Dr. Hook through the whole period which his volume—we cannot say, describes, but—covers; through the details of the Celtic controversy; of the constitution of the Saxon Church, now re-entered into the European fraternity of Churches, under Theodore; of the political controversy touching metropolitans, which again nearly shattered her; of the degeneracy into which both Church and State had sunk when the sharp chastisement of the Danish 'army' came to pour new blood into the enfeebled frame of both; of the reform under Alfred; of the revolution under Dunstan; of the counter-revolution and the great development of the regal supremacy under the Danish dynasty; of the merely political strife of races that degraded even the Church during the feeble days of the Confessor. Let us confine ourselves to the two characters who were respectively the nominal and the real founders of the Anglo-Saxon Church as she was in her best days—to Augustine and to Theodore. In both sketches we shall trace the true appreciation of human nature, and the inadequate investigation of facts, which distinguish Dr. Hook's pages. In both we shall be brought on the track of Church questions such as are not yet obsolete. The lines laid down for the yet unbuilt missionary edifice, and the due adjustment of episcopal and of pastoral superintendence and the desirableness of synodical action in the now completed Church, are as living questions still to the Selwyns and the Mackenzies on the one hand, and to the Wilberforces on the other, and to ourselves their fellow-churchmen, as they were to the Italian and the Greek who were sent to settle them in England in the seventh century.

I. If any man ever had greatness thrust upon him, with which, Malvolio-like, he did not quite know how to deal, that man was Augustine of Canterbury. The Pope and his missionary remind us of nothing more forcibly than of some Arnold or Moberly trying, by mingled rebukes, advice, and warning, to get a timid and awkward boy to act his part properly in the semi-independent sphere of prefect or monitor. Scarcely able to tear himself from the side of the truly great man on whom he leaned—shrinking back from exaggerated difficulties the moment he found himself alone—delaying on the threshold of his enterprise an unreasonable time, yet strangely ignorant, at the end of this

delay, of the true position of the Celtic Churches,¹ already in the land to which he was sent, and still needing interpreters to enable him to preach to his future flock—asking with solemnity the simplest of questions, such as a novice might have settled without troubling the Pope, a thousand miles off, about the matter—catching too readily at immediate and worldly aids to success—and when success came unduly elated—ignoring altogether the pioneers whom he found at work before him, and sensitively proud and unconciliatory towards supposed rivals—Augustine has one claim to our respect, that of a blameless and self-denying Christian life. The one truly missionary soul in Rome (as Dr. Hook justly says) would seem to have been that of Gregory himself. The men to whom he delegated, perforce, his cherished missionary enterprise, were no doubt the best he could find; but it tells ill for the Roman Church of the day, that five years of his papacy passed before he could find even such as they, while six years more elapsed, and three of them after the arrival of Augustine's tidings of his first success, before another band could be mustered to reinforce them. And just one other, and he not from Rome,² and (though consecrated) not sent by the then Pope (Honorius), fills up, at an interval of above thirty years, the entire missionary band which Italy could supply to counter-balance the past Arianism of northern and the coming Islamism of eastern invaders, by new conquests from heathendom. The contrast is a pregnant one, between this scanty, spasmodic, and tardy effort, made with difficulty and not followed up, and the endless flood of self-denying and devoted men who at this very period were pouring out of the Celtic Churches, and carrying the Gospel from the north to every point at which European heathendom could be reached, even up to and over the Alps themselves.

In 595, the abbot of S. Andrew's at Rome quitted his Italian cloister to begin his journey. He did not land in Thanet until 597. Dr. Hook, we think, has rested the account of the delay too much upon the dangers of the journey itself. The need of learning the language, which Franks could teach, was probably its excuse. The '*iners timor*,' to which Bede honestly owns, of the '*fera et barbara et incredula gens cujus ne linguam quidem nossent*,' was plainly in part its cause. Aided by Candidus, the Pope's agent for S. Peter's patrimony in Gaul,—an officer requiring for his duties as much courage and tact, it

¹ See the letter of Archbishop Laurentius in Bede, H. E. ii. 4.

² Thirty years or so further still, after Birinus' mission, and two more were with difficulty found by the Pope to accept Saxon archbishoprics and abbacies. They were a Greek and an African, Theodore and Hadrian.

should seem, as an Irish land-agent of sixty years since, and certainly a capital courier for timid voyagers,—Augustine and his band were, nevertheless, a whole year (spent partly in plying Gregory with an entreaty to be excused their undertaking altogether), before they ventured beyond the comparatively home-quarters of Lerins and Aix. Although armed with credentials (such as Gregory could give) to Frank kings and bishops, from Metz eastward to the strangely out-of-the-way Saintes on the west,¹—omitting however, singularly enough, the king of the still little kingdom of Soissons, which contained all the then ordinary ports of communication with non-Celtic England,—they were a year more before they actually stood on the shore of that nation of fierce countenance whose tongue they could not understand, and which had loomed so terrific across the haze of the distant Channel to their untravelled and unadventurous eyes. Yet the subsequent letters of thanks from Gregory to (among others) Queen Brunehaut and Bishop Syagrius of Autun, including this time Lothaire also of Soissons, and the presence of 'Gallic priests' and 'Frank interpreters' in their band, prove their journey to have been forwarded, both by Church and State, by Gaul and Frank, rather than impeded. While the simple fact of the Christian queen, and her Christian bishop, living in the undisturbed practice of Christian worship in a Christian church in Canterbury itself, might have taught them that the spirit of martyrdom, however admirable, was in their case superfluous.

We trace a like want of loftiness of spirit in their actual missionary labours. Like Dr. Hook, we will assume the circumstances of the landing, not venturing to intrude upon the field which Dr. Stanley has made unapproachably his own. Let it suffice also to note with ungrudging admiration the evangelic and simple teaching which tradition assigns to Augustine's first address—tradition, however, recorded at no earlier date than that of Ælfric, and expanded, seemingly, by Gotselin (whom Dr. Hook quotes) on his own authority—and the manly and sensible wisdom of Ethelbert's reply,—strange contrast to the savage vision that had haunted the timid anticipations of the mis-

¹ Laurentius, in one of his *later* journeys across France, visited Columbanus, it is to be supposed at Luxeuil, but only to increase seemingly his unchristian antipathy to Celts (Bede, *h. e.* ii. 4). Dates render it questionable whether Augustine could have taken the like step himself, had he been so disposed; but his letters of introduction to Orleans, to Tours, and to Saintes, may have been intended to help him to an interview with British bishops in Britany, *e.g.* with Maclou of S. Aleth. The legends about his miracles in Anjou, are worth hardly so much as to be mentioned, but they help to confirm his visit to these parts. Candidus, mentioned in the text, certainly did visit Columbanus subsequently. He may have assisted Laurentius to do the like.

sionaries,—and the wise pomp with which, 'more suo' (as Bede tells us), the future archbishop, 'the dark and swarthy Italian, 'higher by head and shoulders than his companions' (as tradition represents him), entered with chanted litany, and uplifted cross, and bannered picture of the Saviour, the walls of Canterbury. Let us pass to the measures by which he sought to plant and to consolidate his mission. It is one of the earliest missions of which we have any details, and one also of the earliest of those in which the teacher stood upon a distinct elevation above the taught, in temporal civilization as well as spiritual knowledge. It is one, therefore, singularly parallel to most of our missions of the present day.

1. We are first struck by the fact, that, unlike the Churches of the old Roman world, the Saxons were converted, not from below upwards, and gradually, but by a wholly reverse process. Princes and nobles accepted the Gospel, and the mass of the people followed *per saltum*, ready to return to their unextirpated heathenism, should a counterchange of feeling come too soon in their rulers. The British and Scotch missions afford, to a certain extent, a contrast to this feature of the Anglo-Italian. They sought to leaven the mass, as well as to convert the chiefs. The cathedral cities of Canterbury and of Dorchester first, and then Winchester, mark a line of preaching as noteworthy in this respect, as is the opposite line indicated by the retired island of Lindisfarne, or by the chapels in the out-of-the-way corners of Essex established by Cedd, or by the little Norfolk village, where stood the cathedral (if he had one) of Bishop Felix. And Paulinus' teaching in the train of King Eadwin stands in like contrast with that of the itinerant Scotch teachers of Northumbria, and (it must be added) with that also of the Kentish deacon James in the same province. In truth, the Italian and British missionaries were not unlike University men and Dissenters, respectively set to preach to a flock akin educationally and socially to the latter; and the former were not the men to turn their superior refinement into a weapon of power, instead of a cumbrous and repellent armour. We may trace in the results, as on the one hand an account of the early wealth and temporal rank of the Saxon Church and its consequent nationality, so on the other some explanation also of the singular fact of the collapse, after a burst of prosperity, of every Canterbury mission without exception.

2. A ready use of the civil power to promote religion by outward means, is another analogous feature of Augustine's proceedings and those of his company. Not only did Ethelbert engraft the Church at once into the protection of the State, assigning it a very high numerical value in the scale of protective

penalties which formed the substance of the Saxon code,¹ but before half a century had passed idolatry was prohibited, and Lent enforced, in Kent, under penalties. Augustine, it is true, induced Ethelbert to refrain from compulsion. He simply accepted rank and wealth for the Church. It was left to the last Italian primate so to blend Church and State as to make disobedience to Church discipline a punishable crime in Saxon England. Undoubtedly, to have done otherwise would have been to anticipate the growth of thought by many centuries. And the measures desirable for an uncivilized people are not to be judged by the standard of one in a totally different social and intellectual condition. And the principal, though unthought of, result, in subsequent years, of a Church so thoroughly blended with the State, was independence of the Popedom. In no place more than in Saxon England were the clergy,—gentry by their very office,—so little of a clerical caste, so entirely governed by national laws, so blended with all ranks of society including the highest, so little marked (for a time) by the habitual wearing of a peculiar dress, and so tempted to play the layman; so combined in all functions, legislative and judicial, with the civil magistrate; so thoroughly subject to the national courts. Nowhere, save for a while in Carlovingian France, do we find so complete and express a realization of a kingdom modelled after the Jewish in its main politico-ecclesiastical features, as in that system which culminated in Alfred's code of laws. But the fact remains, as characteristic of Augustine that, with the larger views of Gregory, which we may read in the archbishop's instructions to Ethelbert, there was combined a willingness to adopt more immediate and worldly measures, which speedily grew into the extremest theory of a compulsory establishment. That much may be said on both sides is very true. We do not discuss the question, but only note the fact.

3. Dr. Hook has justly noticed a third and kindred feature in the case:—the undue propensity to rest their preaching upon providential interferences which marked the Kentish missionaries. The rain-making, by which Dr. Livingstone was so hardly pressed in Africa, would have been a test which, unlike Dr. Livingstone, we feel persuaded that Augustine would have at least tried to accept. And although the Italians had neither the physical science nor the white man's gun to dazzle or bribe

¹ The certainly not profound question touching theft from Churches, put solemnly by Augustine to Gregory, which excites not unnaturally a passing smile from Dr. Hook, is slightly relieved of its apparent simplicity, if viewed in connection with the laws passed by Ethelbert on the identical subject. The Pope's authority may have appeared desirable for the benefit of the Witenagemot, which, for the first time in Saxon history, was about to 'establish' the Church.

their converts, had they been so disposed, by the privileges of improved health and comfort or superior power, yet they were too much inclined both to interpret the vicissitudes of worldly fortune into immediate and direct declarations from heaven; and to encourage in others, if they did not in their own hearts entertain, a belief in miraculous powers accorded to themselves. The former is, obviously, a double-edged, and so a dangerous argument, as events must soon have rendered it in the present case. With respect to the latter, a distinction must be taken between miracles alleged to have been wrought in the presence of opponents for evidential purposes and to try a direct issue, and those which in an uncritical and ignorant age or place, prepared to expect and to recognise them, cluster round the memory of holy men or holy places, or are attached to periods and crises of religious excitement. The second class (even omitting all obviously legendary stories) come almost exclusively within the sweep of Sir James Mackintosh's destructive canon, quoted by Dr. Hook. They are, in themselves, commonly on that border-land between imagination and fact where it is often impossible even now to determine the point at which the natural ends and the supernatural begins. And the evidence on which they rest is that of credulous or excited minds, incapable, without any imputation upon their honesty, of trustworthy testimony upon the subject. The miracle, then, has still to be proved to be such before we can be called upon to account for it as a miracle. The first class stand upon a different footing, and are incapable of any similar explanation. If the evidence is good, these must, of necessity, be either real miracles or conscious impostures. And if, with Dr. Hook, we believe, *a priori*, that they cannot be the former, and are, with him, unwilling to allow the latter alternative, we must be driven, as a last resource, to follow him in explaining away the evidence on which they rest. Now, in the present case, the miracles indefinitely ascribed to Augustine in Gregory's letter to him, all details of which are mere legend, belong to the second of the two classes above mentioned. And, in the words of Dr. Hook, 'when the enthusiasm' of a 'mass of men, women, and children approaches the very verge of sanity, extraordinary things will occur, which will become more extraordinary still in the narration.' The parallels of not the Jansenists only, or the first Wesleyans, or the Irish revivals, but of every religious fanaticism of all times and places, amply account for the supposition of miracles, without any imputation upon what Dr. Hook loosely calls men's 'general honesty.' But three cases remain, relating respectively to S. Augustine, to Laurentius, and to Paulinus, which are susceptible of no

such middle course. For the conviction respectively of the Britons, of King Eadbald, and of the Northumbrian Eadwin, the restoration of sight to a blind man, a supernatural vision leaving behind very visible material results, and the communication of supernatural information, are distinctly attested by Bede to have occurred. And no one doubts Bede's honesty, as reporting what he himself believed. We confess to inclining in all three instances (though doubtfully) to the hypothesis of pious fraud. That a 'completed Bible' precludes later miracles (which is Dr. Hook's position), appears indeed, to us, a precarious assumption. It limits the purpose of miracles solely to the evidential attestation, and that once for all, of revealed truth. And the withholding of such power from all missionaries at the present day, when combined with the fact that it was possessed by the preachers of the Gospel in primitive times, leaves us still in search of a principle by which to draw the line where such power practically ceased. At the same time, while fully believing that no necessary and absolute moral reason precludes miracles to this day, it is simply impossible to accept the miraculous interpretation of the scourging of Laurentius, or even of the sign by which Augustine sought and failed to compel submission to an unjust claim. And when it is considered further, that the feeling of the age would not have strongly condemned the employment of ingenuity to secure a (supposed) good end, and that at all times the sense of the obligation of openness diminishes towards persons distinctly our inferiors in understanding and culture; so that many people would even now defend the principle of 'economizing' truth towards children; the moral unlikelihood of what we should now rightly condemn as a fraud, becomes materially lessened, even in the case of men otherwise religious and honest. We doubt if the average moral sense of Englishmen would condemn even now those tricks of civilized men upon savages, which Dr. Hook enumerates, assuming that they were played, not out of cruelty, but for a good purpose, as for self-defence, or for the ultimate good of the savages themselves. Add further the ill-drawn line at that day between the natural and the miraculous; the belief on Augustine's part that some kind of miraculous power attached to himself (compare the touching for the king's evil); the strong temptation, both in the easiness and apparent harmlessness of the deceit, and in the emergency of the crisis, which pressed upon the other two; and the greatly diminished improbability of the proceeding on Augustine's part, if it be plain that a like deceit was undoubtedly practised by two of his leading brother-missionaries. And however it may affect our estimate of his character or theirs, the supposition of some sort of half-conscious collusion appears a more likely solu-

tion of the case, than that three stories of a like kind should have grown up within so short a space of time, even in the gossip of a monastery of that age. Dr. Hook, it should be noticed, gets rid of the miracle though not of the deceit in the case of Paulinus by framing his narrative, not upon Bede, but upon his own interpretation of Bede. That the mysterious stranger whose long past words and acts in the distant East Anglian scene of Eadwin's exile, Paulinus knew by revelation, was no other than Paulinus himself, who had been invited to Redwald's court, is Dr. Hook's own assumption, possibly the probable one, yet hardly more so than Neander's hypothesis of an accidental discovery of the story on the part of Paulinus, but by no means admitted or even hinted either by Bede or by Paulinus himself. In this case, as in that of Laurentius, the assumption of the supernatural interference is the turning point of the whole narrative; although we readily admit Dr. Hook's ingenious remark, that, in the history of the British Conference, the whole course of events would run more coherently were the miracle omitted altogether.

4. Concession to heathen practices and prejudices is another marked feature of the Canterbury mission; concession in respect to degrees of marriage, and to the retention of the heathen temples as places of Christian worship, and of the wakes and feasts attached to them: in both cases (though in the latter of the two an afterthought) proceeding from special directions of Gregory himself, and the former being really a concession rendered necessary by the undue strictness of the Papal law. Of accommodation in the actual teaching of the truth itself, either as to the order of the several portions of doctrine to be brought forward, or as to the adapting them to the views of the heathen themselves, we notice no trace. The Chinese Jesuit practices find no precedent in this first of purely Papal missions. Augustine's own teaching, as represented by subsequent tradition, put forward at once, and simply, the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel; a circumstance the more noteworthy when compared with the gradual transition recommended long afterwards by Alcuin (quoted by Dr. Hook) from the lowest foundations of so-called natural religion, by successive steps, to a final teaching of gospel mysteries; and still more when contrasted with the earlier and remarkable letter of Bishop Daniel to the martyr Boniface, laying down for his guidance a distinctive line of argument, by which the heathen superstitions were to be first exhibited in their irrationality, and (it must be added) in the temporal disadvantages which they were represented as bringing upon those who held them, and Christian truths were then to be insinuated by the way into minds convinced of the inadequacy

of their former belief. Augustine seems, to us, in both contrasts, to claim at least the merit of greater simplicity.

The liberality, however, of the concessions which he did make is due to Pope Gregory, not to Augustine. One of these Dr. Hook mentions, though very briefly; the other he has partially misunderstood.

Two classes of questions presented themselves respecting marriage: where was the line to be drawn with respect to affinity and to consanguinity? and in case of marriages contracted before conversion against the law thus enacted, what was to be done if the parties to them became Christians? We commend to the clergy of the diocese of Natal a consideration of the rule laid down upon the latter question. It appears to have been intended to extend to all the classes of marriage specified; although it must be admitted that the words of Gregory strictly taken bind it to that with a brother's widow, and that Eadbald's marriage with his stepmother, although contracted before his baptism, was annulled altogether. Such persons were to be exhorted to live separate, but even in case of refusal were not to be rejected from either baptism or the Lord's Supper; the marriage being plainly held to be in their case valid. As marriages of the kind were prohibited, and were to be held invalid if contracted by Christians, Gregory of course anticipated that the case would be a temporary one which would die out as conversions proceeded. The already over-drawn system of prohibitions and dispensations in the Western Church rendered the other part of the subject far more intricate. Degrees prohibited in Scripture invalidate a marriage. Degrees prohibited only by ecclesiastical law admit of a dispensation. In the former, the Pope refused to concede to heathen laxity at all. Marriage with a stepmother on the father's death, which was a duty among the Teutonic race, was the chief practical difficulty. Gregory expressly forbids it, although at the risk of that which actually occurred, namely, the downfall (for a moment) of the entire mission on the accession of Eadbald. And that king on his baptism was made even to put away his wife, whom he had married, it is true, knowing the Christian prohibition. Marriage with cousins-german is likewise prohibited, with an effort to place the prohibition on Scriptural grounds; and marriage with a brother's widow, for a like reason; both also common among the English of that time. But Dr. Hook has missed the sense of that further rule, which Gregory regarded as a concession, to be retracted as soon as possible. Kinsmen immediately beyond the degree of first cousin—marriage with whom was thought by none to be against Scripture—were to be permitted to marry '*licenter*,' i.e., not '*lawfully*,' as Dr. Hook renders it, but '*by*

a dispensation.' Gregory's own letter to Felix, if it be genuine, and certainly the subsequent commentary of the Penitentials, and the repeated enactments of the later Saxon kings, show that, as a permanent rule, the Pope intended to prohibit, not to permit, marriage in the third and fourth degrees (reckoning according to the Papal reckoning in such matters, and calling cousins-german the second). The former of the two (between second cousins) is pronounced invalid altogether, and the latter is prohibited, but (apparently), if contracted, not dissolved, by Theodore and by Egbert of York. And the civil laws fix the limit of permissible marriage at the sixth degree, which in their reckoning is equivalent to that of the Penitentials. It is candid to add, with a view, not to Dr. Hook, but to the unhappy marriage questions of the day, that although repeated mention occurs in Anglo-Saxon canons of the prohibition to a woman to marry two brothers successively, the converse case, of a man marrying two sisters, is not in terms mentioned. At the same time the laws of Ethelred and Canute show, that the words of Gregory and the subsequent ecclesiastical prohibitions included the latter case under the former.

Architectural reasons, it is to be supposed, prevented any general compliance with Gregory's advice respecting the temples. The church of S. Pancras, at Canterbury, is the one recorded instance of compliance with it. And the zeal of the converted priest himself in Northumbria caused the utter destruction of the northern shrine at Godmundingham. The retention of the wakes conducted, it is to be feared, to the persistence of ~~the~~ abundant popular heathenism to which Saxon canons bear witness, almost as long as there was a Saxon Church. As a practical question, similar topics must arise in our own heathen missions. We commend to them the warning which S. Gregory's well-meant license and its consequences convey.

5. Both these points of large-mindedness, however, wise or unwise, are due to Gregory, not to Augustine. The timid narrowness of the latter shows itself, again, in his uneasiness respecting the variations in the Liturgy, which, probably enough (as Dr. Hook says), his French journey had brought home to him. And this is the more marked, through contrast with Gregory's noble injunction, in reply, to take of the best, no matter whence, for the unencumbered field of the new Church. At the same time, the facts do not bear out the full extent of Dr. Hook's condemnation. It may have been, indeed, that poor Bishop Liudhard's ministrations excited the Italian's jealousy. He made, certainly, little use of the Gallic bishop, although suffering him to minister at Canterbury apparently until his death. But Dr. Hook leaves an erroneous impression in leading

us to suppose him jealous of the Gallic Liturgy. We refer to Mr. Philip Freeman's better informed pages¹ for evidence, that what, in compliance with Gregory's injunctions, he really did, was to adopt into English use the Communion Office of the Roman, with some changes, and the ordinary Offices of the Southern French Churches, these latter having been framed by Cassian on an Oriental model. We learn further, from Mr. Maskell, a still more curious fact—that in the Saxon, not Liturgy indeed, but Pontifical, are preserved rites actually drawn from the British. That Augustine introduced them there can hardly have been the case. We suppose, rather, that they found their way into Egbert's York Pontifical in the first instance; although they occur, we learn, in one that belonged to S. Dunstan also, and were even transported across the Straits to Northern France. One of these we cannot but mention. It is pleasant to think that in the significant delivery of the Gospels to the newly-ordained deacon, we of the English Church are, to this day, preserving a custom handed down from the earliest Church of this island—from the Church that wrested her from idolatry in the days of imperial Rome—a custom which stood the shock of Saxon invasion, and the liturgical changes of the Middle Ages, to symbolize, in brighter times, the one Church which retains an open and accessible Bible.

6. But if with poor Liudhard, yet with others Augustine was not able to fraternize. There were churchmen in his path who followed not with him, or with Rome. A few years later, on the other side of the channel, the identical dispute about Scotch and Roman customs arose, and came to a head in the Council of Matiscon. But there the missionary success and lofty piety of the Scotch monks, stretching their pious labours continuously round the whole east and north of France, from the Swiss Rhine to the promontories of Britany, compelled respectful treatment. Eligius' conduct towards the Scotch abbot of Luxeuil stands in creditable contrast with that of Augustine towards the British. And the charitable dealing on both sides of the controversy ended in the gradual and peaceful absorption of obnoxious or singular customs. A plate in Mabillon gives us both Latin and Celtic tonsures, as worn respectively in the middle of the seventh century, by two loving coadjutors in the missionary work of the north-east of France at that time. That it

¹ We are sorry to see Dr. Hook endorse, with no small amount of inaccuracies, the strangely shallow blunder of the Orientalism of the *British Churches*. The real importation of Orientalism was through the Saxon Church, borrowing, through Augustine, an Orientalized Service-book from Cassian, and adding a few, though very few, additional Orientalisms, through Theodore. Mr. Freeman, however, himself gives in to a trifling error in adopting the supposition that Augustine remained two years at Arles when he went thither to be consecrated.

was otherwise ultimately in Britain itself, arose, first of all, from the pride of Augustine. And once arisen, the schism possibly was best put down within Britain by measures such as were dictated by the fiery zeal of Wilfrid, and finally executed by the iron will of Theodore.

For be it observed, that the British Church was not in opposition to the Roman, or to any other Church, before Augustine made it so. It had simply been severed by distance and by a broad barrier of heathenism from any practical communication with other Churches, and had developed accordingly after its own unaided powers. The case was as of two relatives, who came together after a long parting, and discovered that, during their separation, one of them had contracted certain peculiar views, and retained certain errors formerly common to both, uncorrected,¹ but in no point of any serious importance. And Gregory accordingly did not intend to ignore the remnant of the British Church. On the contrary, he made especial provision for its permanence, by seeking to re-establish only those two archiepiscopates, with their suffragan sees, which would represent the already heathenized parts of Britain. London and York left Caerleon to remain as it was. And the power which he professed to give to Augustine over the suffragan of Caerleon was (we agree with Dr. Hook) simply the power of metropolitan or archbishop, which had possibly rested with the see of London in British times. What, then, the Britons refused,² was,

¹ The British Easter, for instance, was simply identical with what had been the Roman Easter some century and a half before. But the Britons stuck to the Old Style, after science had devised in more astronomical regions a newer and better one; and then behaved about it, much as the old couple who persisted a century since in going to church on Good Friday, Old Style, to find of course no service.

² Taking as guides (1) the borders of the Hwiccas and of Wessex in later times (Bede's one mark of the locality), i.e. the southern border of Gloucestershire, and (2) the Roman roads which intersected it, either by Cirencester, to reach Gloucester, or by Bristol, to pass by Aust and across the Passage to Caerleon, and (3) the fact that at the time of Augustine's visit Saxon power reached in the south-west solely along the southern bank of the Thames, westward to Wilts, and then by a narrow strip, thrust between Gloucester and still British Somersetshire, to the Severn, the whole centre of England being still British, it seems plain that the Welsh tradition (Iolo MSS.), which places Augustine's oak in the Forest of Dean opposite Aust, is almost certainly correct. Ethelbert's power could not have brought Augustine in contact with Britons anywhere else so near to Caerleon. Aust, no doubt, may be *Trajectus Augusti*; so that no stress can be laid upon the name. As to the seven Bishops, about whom Dr. Hook is all astray, there is a Welsh list in the same MSS. (upon which we lay no stress, except from internal probability), which gives the Welsh Bishops (as we should now call them), but according to their then sees, together with a chorepiscopus or two from the immediate neighbourhood, and the still Welsh Bishop of Hereford:—scil. Llanelwy, Llandaff, Llanbadarn, Bangor, Weeg, Morganwg; headed by Hereford, and omitting S. David's. S. David himself died 601, according to the Ann. Cambrise. The lists in Spelman and Ussher are lists of alleged suffragans of S. David's belonging to the twelfth century, when Giraldus was doing gallant battle for Wales against Canterbury; and have as much to do with Augustine's opponents as Bishop Thirwall and his brethren have.

not Gregory as Pope, but (as Bede expressly says) Augustine for Archbishop. And it was the temper shown by Augustine which moved them to decline what certainly would have been in time the natural arrangement, as it is this day, but what, as the representative of invaders, barely established in the land, and still almost wholly heathens, he had as certainly no right to demand. That the insecure occupant of a petty mission should step at once into the position of even the British Archbishop of London or York, both by the way not impossibly surviving in their own proper persons, at the very time that Gregory was filling their sees with Roman monks;—or, again, that the missionary bishop of an invading tribe, whose permanent possession of the island must have been far from being a recognised fact in the minds of the British, and whose fellow-countrymen, close to the very time, were ravaging and destroying the British soil on both sides of the river where the conference was held, should claim submission to his primacy from British bishops;—were neither of them very self-evident conclusions either from Church law or from common sense. The Britons might well think that a turn of fortune might speedily bring a British monarch back to London itself. Welsh princes claimed the throne of the entire island for a century after Augustine's conference; and once were not far from possessing it. Why should the Church surrender hopes which the State still maintained? Even co-operation in preaching to the heathen was almost impossible, so long as border-war was raging between the peoples; while British missionaries did preach the Gospel even to Saxons, so soon as it could be done. And when we consider the charitable disentanglement of the same controversy by an opposite tone and opposite measures, on the other side of the channel, we cannot but hold Augustine personally answerable for the angry feeling that embittered the Cornish and Welsh Britons in their relation to the Saxon Church. At the same time, party feeling must be strong, and ignorance great, for persons then to invent, and writers now (not, assuredly, Dr. Hook) to repeat, the preposterous libel which converts a hasty speech into a deliberate prophecy, and imagines that any words of the Christian priest either were able, or were needed, to influence the wild Northumbrian pagan, some dozen years after, to shed the blood of Welshmen and monks at the slaughter of Bangor.

An estimate of the true value of Augustine's mission would, we think, seriously alter the view commonly entertained of it. We have tried faintly to suggest some reasons why its direct results should have been so small, but of the fact that they were so there can be no question. The first-fruits of Saxon Christianity were undoubtedly due to him, but they were first-fruits very

slightly connected with the subsequent harvest. The technical transmission of our apostolical succession may be through Augustine. The living stream of Gospel truth mainly passed to us through British channels. Even the 10,000 converts of the report that reached Gregory seem to us to clash with any reasonable idea of the then probable population of Kent. But of one thing there can be no doubt—that had it not been for British missionaries, and for the independent mission of Birinus, there would not have been one Christian Saxon fifty years after the mission was planted outside the boundaries of the Kentish kingdom. The apostle of the English is as much entitled to his fame as Amerigo Vespucci is to the discovery of America. The proportion of Jute, Saxon, and Angle, represents pretty accurately the respective dimensions, in the result, of the Canterbury mission, of that of Birinus, restored by the Scotch-taught but Romanizing Frank Agilbert, and of the purely Scotch and British missions. Every Christian man north of the Thames (with the most petty exceptions) owed his restoration to, and confirmation in, the faith—and except those of the eastern shires, from York¹ downwards, his conversion also—to teachers directly or indirectly Scotch. Every one from Sussex westwards south of the same river Thames, traced his Christianity to labours set on foot by a single Italian, but not from Canterbury, and mainly prosecuted by a Frank and by a Northumbrian. The record of the sixty years' labours of the entire Italian Kentish mission is summed up, after the Kentish success, in three failures to extend their limits—in Middlesex, York, and East Anglia,—in the permission accorded to one of another race and Church to make a more successful effort in the last named of the three, and in a simple abstinence from any effort at all to convert the little county of Sussex, which remained pagan at their very doors after the last Italian prelate had been laid in S. Augustine's porch. If Augustine then is to be the Hengist of the Christian Conquest, his merits must be reduced to the proportions assigned by later philosophical historians to his secular prototype; and the Christianizing, as the Teutonizing, of the island beyond the narrow limits of Kent must be awarded to others.

But the indirect results of the Italian mission were of very different proportions. Had it not been for the link thus riveted between Canterbury and Rome, the Celtic Church of this island itself would speedily have swept back with a returning wave over the country which, as it was, had been wrested from it,

¹ A British missionary baptized Eadwin, according to Nennius; and certainly it is not improbable that Britons co-operated with the mission of Paulinus at the court of one who, according to probable tradition, had spent his boyhood in exile in a Christian Welsh court.

only for a few years by the heathen Saxons, and which in the main it actually did reconquer; and would have severed the whole land effectually from southern or from continental influences. But the ineffective Canterbury prelates of the first mission were as a door that opened a way for a spirit far more potent than their own. And in the result, the Saxon Church became both the pioneer and the most friendly admirer of the Popes in Northern Europe. Had it not been for her, the Christian world might well have seen, in the seventh century, a combination of Churches, of which the British islands would have been the nucleus, and its advanced posts stretching from Iceland at one extreme, to Columbanus' convent of Bobbio on the Lombard plains at the other, with almost everything that can constitute a distinct and vigorous school of religion,—learning, devotion, missionary zeal, and extraordinary missionary aptitude,—all flowing in home-made channels, and marked off by the not unimportant badges of a peculiar clerical habit, and a special fashion of ecclesiastical plain-song, and of ritual, and of liturgy, and by its own calendar of festivals—as widely spread and far better united than the Rome itself of that day, untorn by dissensions, unassailed by Arian barbarians, and as independent of Rome as the patriarchates of Antioch or Alexandria. One element of permanence, as regards a lasting antagonism, was indeed lacking. There was no distinctive principle in any way touching upon the affections or reaching the soul, upon which this independence rested; while in the main question at issue—that of Easter—the British were undoubtedly mistaken. And under such circumstances contact and intercourse must sooner or later have absorbed the Celtic communion into that of Rome,—the less refined, and less centred, and less historically great,—into that which was all these things in a singular degree. It was the work of the Saxon Church, under the influences arising out of the Canterbury mission, to accelerate that absorption. That which Augustine unintentionally began, Theodore and Boniface designedly completed. And the mission of Augustine, in itself an abortive beginning, which, in the presence of a far more Missionary Church, waned for a while and was anticipated in its proper task of converting the British islands to Christianity, succeeded at any rate in keeping the way open to unite them to Rome.

II. From the nominal let us pass to the real founder of the English Church: from the pious though not large-minded missionary, whose labours scarcely took root, to the practical administrator, the lines of whose building in the Church of our land underlie its foundations, and remain in substance unchanged to this very day—from Augustine the Italian to Theodore the Greek.

To secure the victory which the genius of Wilfrid had already gained over the Celtic communion, and to reap the harvest which that communion had chiefly sown, by consolidating the Churches which they mainly and not his own friends had established, out of isolated mission stations (in Dr. Hook's words) into a settled and organized whole,—such was Theodore's work. It was a work that required administrative talent rather than genius, a resolute and practical will rather than a brilliant or profound character, a statesman more than a theologian. The 'Philosopher,'—such was his nickname—at the age of sixty-six, chosen apparently in pure honesty by the Pope,¹ yet to some extent because he could find no one else for the task, and with some distrust of his supposed Greek peculiarities, proved nevertheless, by success, the providence that had guided the choice.

1. Of Theodore's treading out of the Celtic spirit, Dr. Hook says but little, and that little is not wholly correct. His remark is indeed a just one, and to the deserved credit of the Scottish missionaries—that they had made their Saxon converts Christians and not partizans. And when we remember further, that there was no principle or article of faith involved in the question, and that changes in a Latin ritual, and in the rule for determining Easter, were matters touching the clergy almost exclusively, and which once done would be hardly felt by laymen, we shall understand, on the one hand, how the retirement of the persistent part of the Scottish clergy (already brought about by Wilfrid at Whitby) could so effectually uncelticize the Saxon Churches, and, on the other, the wisdom, though hardly the justice, of Theodore's measures for preserving the ground thus won. He simply declared Scotch or British orders invalid, not altogether (as Dr. Hook implies), but until confirmed by a Catholic Bishop—a provision actually renewed, and therefore we suppose held to be required, at so late a period as 816, by Archbishop Wulfred, after the Celtic Churches had conformed to the Roman Easter, but which, one would have thought, even in Theodore's time, must have operated chiefly to keep out men who had already fled. One, however, not wholly but in part of the obnoxious class, remained, but one who had conformed in the matters disputed. But Theodore endured not even the shadow of an exception to his rule. As two of Chad's three

¹ We cannot quite agree with Dr. Hook, that the two Saxon kings *did* leave the choice to the Pope. They asked him to consecrate Wigheard. He, upon Wigheard's death, chose some one else, and consecrated him. This, if Bede's account is complete, they had certainly not asked him to do; although, under the circumstances, it was natural enough that he should do it: and he seems to have bestowed the by no means coveted piece of preferment (or banishment) honestly. That he chose a Greek to conciliate the Oriental Church of Britain is a fancy which falls to the ground with the crotchet on which it is founded.

consecrators were British bishops, and, therefore (by Dr. Hook's leave), *not* in communion with Canterbury, whatever Bishop Wini might have thought of them, Theodore enforced compliance with the strictest (indeed, an over strict) interpretation of his own rule, by refusing to recognise Chad's episcopal (not, as Dr. Hook conjectures, priestly) orders, until he had himself confirmed them. A still more arbitrary enactment placed Scotch and British baptism in the category of baptisms of uncertain validity, and commanded conditional rebaptism. Another provision, in a different place, deposes priests who do not baptize by trine immersion. And the practice of single immersion, found at Dol in Britany so late as 1620, lends probability to Kunstmann's conjecture that we have here the defect in baptism imputed by Augustine to the British—a conjecture deriving some support from the dropping of the objection by Augustine, inasmuch as Gregory, at the very time, in a letter to Spanish bishops, ruled the point to be indifferent.¹ Theodore, then, may have seized upon this ground, to widen the difference, opinion in the European Churches gradually tending towards making trine immersion necessary. He may have sought in it something like a doctrinal ground to justify his arbitrary assumption of a formal schism. At the same time, he does not venture to stigmatize the Celtic Churches as heretical. For heretical baptism and heretical orders, in the teeth of canons and councils, he pronounces invalid altogether. But whatever his reason, the measure shows at once the character of the man—resolute, uncompromising, and harsh, determined to enforce uniformity, yet striking heavily only where he was sure of his blow, and was safe from a recoil.

2. His administration of the English Church thus Saxonized is marked by equal foresightedness, and by a like determination, but by greater management, and by measures of a nobler and more Christian cast. The pastoral system, thoroughly supervised by bishops, with sees of manageable dimensions, and worked by an educated clergy, and the whole regulated by an annual synod,—such were the four points on which, helped perhaps by Eastern experience, his whole work was concentrated. It is significant of his wisdom, and little creditable to ourselves, that the effectual working of these very points, as adapted to our altered circumstances, should be precisely what the same English Church, after almost 1,200 years, is at length piecemeal wresting for herself from a reluctant and irreligious public opinion. It

¹ The canon respecting baptism, alleged by S. Boniface to have existed in the English Church since the time of Augustine, and declaring the naming *all* the Persons of the Holy Trinity necessary to a valid baptism, looks the same way.—S. Bonif. Epist. 82, ad Zach. Papam.

is true that some doubt may be made whether Theodore organized the parish system, or, at any rate, to what extent he succeeded in establishing it. Elmham, the one direct authority for the statement, may perhaps have interpreted *parochia* into parish, when it really meant diocese. And there are proofs of itinerant missions in the North still existing half a century later. Nor could such a system, established as his was by the efforts of private persons, be established, in the nature of the case, otherwise than gradually. But the whole system of the Penitential, and the undoubted growth of parishes in the modern sense in the eighth century, show plainly that the idea of the parish underlay his plans, and that he at least originated the movement which, in course of time, has developed into our present network of village churches, each with its appointed priest, in settled pastoral relations to a definite flock.

Dr. Hook's account of the division of sees, Theodore's first great work, is singularly jejune and hasty. Yet there is much that is curious and instructive, and a good deal of intricate history in the matter. Unhappily, bishops were to be found even then to oppose a perverse obstinacy to a measure, resting, it should seem, on the first principles of religion and of common sense. The same grounds which afterwards induced both the chief English States, and the European States generally, to struggle for a special and single metropolitan apiece, appear, in the present instance, to have led them to struggle for a single bishop, and thus to have thrown political influence commonly against Theodore. And conquest and reconquest again shifted sees by a more summary process still, as in the cases of Stow or Sidnaceaster, Whitherne, and possibly Dorchester. But the chief opposition, sad to say, arose from the bishops themselves. The wealth and dignity attached to the single see of an entire state, appears to have been commonly the unworthy motive to that opposition. A see that stretched from the Humber to the Forth, or southward from the Humber to the Thames, presented a territorial grandeur of idea, and a more solid amount of episcopal lands, which the holders could not bring themselves to relinquish; although a bishop only of the Graham type could administer them, and even Bishops Tait and Waldegrave would, we hope, have shrunk from the undertaking. Wessex, from the very beginning, anticipated Theodore's measures by a 'synodica sanctio,'—evidently passed in a provincial Witenagemot, and, prompted by former attempts at a division of the kind,—which crushed the idea in the bud by assenting to the continued union of the whole kingdom in the hands of the new Bishop Leutharius. And a subsequent decree of Theodore, derived, however, from a questionable source, surrenders

the hope of accomplishing the division under the plea of respect for the individual bishop, at that time Theodore's personal friend, Hæddi. In East Anglia alone, we read of no opposition. In Mercia and Northumbria, the object was accomplished only by the deposition and banishment of the respective bishops. We have not space to detail the very complicated mode of its accomplishment, which is obscured by the contradictions, as well as by the omissions, of the chroniclers. But it ought to be stated—Dr. Hook leaves us in ignorance—that, on the most probable reckoning, modern England, with her at least twenty-fold population, deems sufficient to this day for the portion of the country where Theodore accomplished his purpose, more bishops by precisely two than Theodore himself established.¹ Manchester and Ripon are the literal measure as yet of the tardy increase which the nineteenth century has deemed it necessary to make upon the seventh. It must be noted also that, in Theodore's plan of division, Gregory's original scheme was entirely ignored. All the bishops of the entire Heptarchy, including York, were made subject to the single primacy of Canterbury. Further, that the divisions were made by Kings and Witenagemots, in co-operation with Theodore. And a comparison with Leofric's proceedings in the time of Edward the Confessor, respecting the removal of the see of Crediton to Exeter, will mark forcibly the increased interference of the See of Rome at the latter period, and that, too, a time when Edward gave away bishoprics by charter, much as he would have given his lands. Lastly, that Theodore made no change in the practice which he found in Northumbria (as in Canterbury itself), of monastic chapters and abbot-bishops; although the rule in Mercia appears to have been different, with the exception of Worcester. In all this, as in the gradual method generally of the Archbishop's proceedings, in his politic compromise and reserve (so oddly represented by Dr. Hook) at the Council of

¹ With Wessex Theodore could not interfere. We assume, on the strength of Bede's otherwise incomprehensible *Ætla* of Dorset, and other probabilities too long to detail, that (as Florence implies) there was an attempt to preserve the See of Dorchester, as well as that of Stow or Sidnacester. And we set Whitherne against Carlisle. There remain, then, the following lists:—

- | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1. Canterbury | = 1. Canterbury. | 9. Stow | = 10. Lincoln. |
| 2. Rochester | = 2. Rochester. | 10. Hereford | = 11. Hereford. |
| 3. London | = 3. London. | 11. Worcester | = 12. Worcester. |
| 4. Dunwich | } = 4. Norwich. | 12. York | = 13. Gloucester. |
| 5. Elmham | | 13. Ripon | = 14. York. |
| | 5. Ely. | 14. Hexham | = 15. Ripon. |
| | 6. Peterborough. | 15. Lindisfarne | = 16. Durham. |
| 6. Lichfield | = 7. Lichfield. | | 17. Manchester. |
| 7. Leicester | = 8. Chester. | 16. Whitherne | = 18. Carlisle. |
| 8. Dorchester | = 9. Oxford. | | |

Hertford, in his concession to Wessex, in the pertinacity with which, even when helping in 686 to restore Wilfrid, he restored him, not to the York which he had refused to surrender, but to a diocese of the precise limits (save that it still included Ripon), which he had before indignantly declined,—we read at once the skill and the resolution of the practised ruler,—the strong rock against which the passionate vivacity of Wilfrid dashed itself in vain.

The Penitential of Theodore, however, is the chief proof of the solidity and thoroughness of his work. Assuming (what at present we have no means of correcting) that the work as we have it is substantially Theodore's, it proves him to have aimed at establishing throughout the land what we should now call the principle of parishes. A church with its proper presbyter, and with its weekly mass and (as it appears subsequently) sermons, was to be provided for each district, the landowner finding the funds in return for the patronage, or, at any rate, the patronage accruing to him, be the founder who he might. A yearly confession prior to Christmas-day¹ was to bring each layman, with his wife and household, into pastoral relation with his presbyter. And a system of discipline of the minutest kind was to bind together the whole of each flock into an organized member of a well-knit body, each parish under its presbyter, and all combined in direct and practical subordination to the bishop. How much of this Theodore simply borrowed is not quite plain. The Scotch Penitentials may have suggested it in small part: but that of Cummiānus is a mere sketch in comparison with Theodore's; and the *Regula Columbani* is an ascetic code of Christian manners for a monastery, not (as is Theodore's) a directory for a presbyter in the management of a parish, which the presbyter indeed alone was intended to see. His Eastern experience may have been of more direct help; and the spurious Penitential in the Appendix to the Benedictine S. Jerome, is the pattern nearest to the copy. But the parochial element which is assumed as the corner-stone of the whole, is characteristic, as far as we know, of Theodore's; although Dr. Hook has pointed out that Justinian's Code may have suggested even this. He takes care even to provide that, where a monastery exchanges lands, a presbyter shall be supplied to that district, which, by passing out of the hands of the monastery, was no longer supplied with pastoral ministrations by the monastery itself. And confirmation by the bishop in the open air, evidently on the

¹ See Egbert's Dialogue; Thorpe, ii. 96. Possibly, they might choose their own confessors at this season. At any rate, the words are 'ad suos confessores.' A comparison of Egbert's rules with Theodore's will show that the parochial system had become much more complete at the later date.

ground of the smallness of the church, is spoken of as permissible only in case of necessity, the existence of churches everywhere being plainly assumed. Throughout, the principle underlies the whole scheme, that each member of the Christian Church in England shall be placed in a pastoral relation to a special presbyter attached to a particular Church. What was to be the nature of that relation must be judged, in Theodore's case, by the divinity of the time. At any rate, confession to God is expressly declared by Theodore himself to be sufficient. And confession to a priest is for the purpose of learning at the spiritual physician's hands the measures of a truer and more solid repentance. The wisdom, again, of these measures themselves must be judged in the abstract no doubt by the results, but in regard to Theodore himself (as Dr. Hook truly and candidly says), by the point of view in which the subject would have presented itself prior to the making of the experiment at all. The strange literalness with which, not in this work only, but in many other ways, divines of that age used the Old Testament—(e. g. the so called Penitential of Theodore not only begins in the *MS.* with the Ten Commandments [after the Augustinian reckoning, the second merged in the first], but the prohibitions about usury, and much of those about clean and unclean animals, strange to say, are simply borrowed by it, as by Egbert and Boniface afterwards)—the exceeding minuteness with which degrees of sin are distinguished—the enormous severity of the penalties—the speedy introduction of commutations of penance, some of them of the most whimsically mischievous kind (and we have probably Egbert's authority for assigning commutations of some sort to Theodore himself)—the inevitable externalization of morals resulting from such a minute quantitative measure of outward acts—the temptation arising from the mere bulk and duration and extent of the penances to exalt these into ends and not instruments, into meritorious compensations instead of a discipline to lead the soul more truly to the Saviour and Judge Himself,—all this, apart from any particular question of doctrine, may be truly alleged against the system itself. But it may be still made a question—we heartily enter into Dr. Hook's remarks on the subject—whether this real, and grand, and heart-searching, though doubtless mistaken, attempt to build up in the hearts of men the perfecting of holiness in the fear of God, is not at least as good as the substituting for all such attempts the mere weekly listening to a favourite preacher. Theodore, at any rate, must be judged by the antecedents and circumstances of his own time, not by the maturer experience of our own. And for one thing at least we owe to him, under God, unmixed gratitude—that he has established in

this Church of ours, as one of its very foundation-stones, the principle that each individual Christian ought to have his own Church, and to stand in a distinct and recognised relation to his own pastor. For the condition of morals, again, with which he had to deal, he is not to be held answerable. And much that is repulsive in his work arises from the nature of the sins with which he felt it a duty to grapple, as well as from the habit of plain-speaking in an age certainly not delicate. The book, too, expressly limits its own readers to the presbyters whom it was intended to guide. It is doubtful, again, to what extent his system was realized. His penitential rules had no other authority than that which his name would give them. But we know from Egbert's wholesale adoption of them—from the repeated copies of them down to the eleventh century—from the use made of them by later bishops, who modified and added to them until the exact original has been buried under the later variations—from the continued reference to Theodore as the originator of all rules of the kind in England—that their authority in point of fact stood high. Yet the Council of Cloveshoo under Cuthbert condemned a commutation of penance, impudently put forward, yet it must be owned with considerable justification, by a certain rich man, which it would be hard to distinguish from some allowed, or said to be so, by Theodore himself. And, of course, it stands to reason that no system of the kind could ever be enforced without the largest possible amount of practical modification. Yet, on the other hand, the concessions which are made by the book itself must have tended to prolong and to extend its effectiveness by diminishing the difficulties which lay in its path. Lastly, the system of penalties in the Saxon civil laws, justly compared by Dr. Hook, must have smoothed the way for the parallel system in this ecclesiastical code. In point of minute estimate of the outward act of wrong, and of precise apportionment of penalty, the laws of the Saxon kings, and not least those of Alfred himself, far exceed those of the Greek Archbishop. And the people who were accustomed to pay a varying penalty for bodily injuries, according as it were the great toe or the little one, the great tooth or the canine tooth or the grinder, that was injured, would have found nothing strange in the far more widely graduated scale of the rules of Theodore.

His educational schemes may be found briefly described in Dr. Hook's pages. Their success is testified by the results. That which produced directly Aldhelm, indirectly Bede, must have been a school where the devotional discipline and the standard of intellect and of learning stood alike high. But this, though Theodore was its moving spirit, was the direct work of Hadrian. It led, at any rate, to that first and early

glory of S. Augustine's as a training school, which, though with a different aim (like the less significant case of the ecclesiastical position of Lindisfarne), the nineteenth century has seen revived.

The synodical action of the Church was the regulating principle by which it must be supposed that Theodore intended to keep the working of his system true. And here again both political questions and ecclesiastical disputes seem to have interfered from the beginning with the fulfilment of the appointed rule of an annual meeting. At the same time, the probability that no record would be kept of a synod where nothing of importance was done, and the discovery, through the documents published by Kemble, of many synods or meetings of bishops, known only by the accident of their having at the time of the synod attested some petty gift or exchange of lands, renders it quite possible that synods might have been held a good deal more regularly than there is any trace of documents to prove. It is more remarkable, that the first recorded synod of the whole English Church after that of Hertford (673), was held and by Theodore himself, not at Cloveshoo, the appointed place, but at Hatfield (680); and that no synod is known to have been held at Cloveshoo before that of Cuthbert, assigned commonly to 747. On the locality of Cloveshoo itself, unfortunately, we can throw no more light than may be contained in the observation, that S. Boniface invariably styles the English synod, '*Synodus Londinensis*;' and that (inasmuch as in the middle of the eighth century he could hardly have cherished any still lingering idea of the archiepiscopate of London) the immediate vicinity of that city—in all other respects the most probable of all localities—seems consequently the place where antiquarians must hunt for traces of the lost Cloveshoo.

3. One feature remains to complete this hasty sketch of Theodore's Archiepiscopate—his attitude towards the Popes and towards Wilfrid. On this topic also, Dr. Hook, as usual, is correct in outline but inaccurate in detail. Later scribes tell us, in copies of Theodore's Penitential, that he carefully avoided contradicting the decrees of the Popes. The Penitential itself, even as we have it, shows, on the contrary, that he recorded the customs of Greeks and Romans as of like authority, as precedents to be followed or not according to their intrinsic value, and set aside the latter where it suited him without scruple.¹ A like spirit pervaded his acts.

¹ We may note out of the Penitential, as of present interest, (1) a permission, in case of need, to have but one sponsor, of either sex (this is one of the not many Orientalisms in which we may trace the Greek of Tarsus); (2) a prohibition, on pain of excommunication, of presence at mass without communicating; (3) an inti-

In the one subject of dispute which arose—the attempt to reverse his division of English sees by the authority of the Pope, an attempt which, begun by others, culminated in the case of Wilfrid—Theodore was perfectly willing to explain or to conciliate, but he pursued his original purpose to the end unmoved. An opposition to his measures had been attempted at Rome antecedently to Wilfrid, probably by Winfrid of Lichfield. Of the seemingly three Councils, held at Rome in 680, that have any relation to England, the first had no reference to Wilfrid, and ended in the despatch of a messenger to Theodore with some general instructions about English bishoprics, and a special message relating to the Monothelite controversy; the second discussed the cause of Wilfrid, and passed a decree in his favour; the third, at which the Pope expected Theodore's personal presence, was held in order to transmit a collective declaration of the orthodoxy of the West respecting Monothelitism to the forthcoming Council of Constantinople. Theodore sent explanations by messengers, and held a Council in England to do his part in making up the Western declaration of faith—the one interference of the Saxon Church in Eastern or metaphysical controversy—but refrained from appearing at Rome in person, and simply ignored the Pope's letters in favour of Wilfrid.¹ Five years elapsed, passed by Wilfrid in prison or exile. And then we are told by Wilfrid's enthusiastic biographer that, moved by the approach of death and by the persuasions of friends, the Archbishop yielded. A closer examination shows that his concession was of that kind which simply maintains its own ground. The York which Wilfrid had grasped so tenaciously was a diocese conterminous with the kingdom of Northumbria, extended at the time for a short while over the Humber

mation, not a command, in favour of weekly communion; (4) a prohibition of lay baptism in general, but a provision enforcing it in case there be none but a layman present, and the person to be baptized be at point of death; (5) a prohibition, not only of field labour (sheep-shearing, by the way, was *woman's* work among the Saxons), but of shaving or bathing on the Lord's-day, but with an exception in favour of washing the head and feet; (6) that intentional desertion of a man by his wife for five years leaves the husband free, with the bishop's consent, to marry again: a similar permission being extended, without mentioning the bishop, to both husband and wife, if either were carried into captivity, after five years if nothing were heard of the captive; after seven if it were impossible to redeem him or her; (7) the imposition of three years' penance upon a presbyter, two upon a deacon, one upon a subdeacon, who should be guilty of the iniquity of *hunting*.

¹ That Wilfrid was legate of the English Church or of Theodore, at the third council mentioned above, is merely the assertion of the Roman scribe of the council, assimilating the style of Wilfrid's signature to that of other bishops, who were legates of their respective Churches. Eddius, whose evidence is in such a case indisputable, and Bede from him, giving the precise words of Wilfrid's signature, show that he simply testified, as on personal knowledge, being present at the council, and now acquitted, and (by the Pope) restored to the orthodoxy of not only Saxons but also Britons, and Scots, and Picts. He certainly was not the legate of the three last.

into Lincolnshire, and stretching northward to the Forth. The York to which Wilfrid was restored was the York of modern days, prior to the severance from it of Ripon; a see conterminous with the kingdom of Deira only, from which Lincoln had been severed again by the fortunes of war. And the sees of Bernicia, now two in number (omitting Whitherne), remained separate as Theodore had arranged them, and were, upon Wilfrid's restoration, held by him simply *in commendam*, and successively, for one year apiece, upon the deaths of their respective holders, until a successor (*not* Wilfrid) was consecrated to each. The only counter-concession in the case was made by the two occupants of the sees of York (thus limited) and Ripon, Bosa and Eadhæd, who gave way to the restoration of Wilfrid, apparently at the request of Theodore, preferred to the Northumbrian king. Conciliation, not concession, is the proper term for the transaction thus explained—conciliation towards the zealous Wilfrid, fresh from his noble mission to the people of Sussex—conciliation towards the Papal see, which, in decreeing the restoration of Wilfrid, had decreed also that his episcopate should subsequently be divided but to bishops of his own choice.

And now the aged Archbishop might peaceably contemplate his finished work for the short remainder of his life,—troubled, unhappily, by wars and rumours of wars near home, between Kent and Wessex, but able to rejoice in the substantial accomplishment of the Church labours which he had set himself, and in their results,—the last spot of Anglo-Saxon heathendom at length covered by the waters of the Gospel,—the earliest mission of that Church, the streamlet-parent of a mighty flood, shedding its first refreshing drops upon the mother-land of the Saxons across the channel,—the schism of Wilfrid healed for the time, and, as far as Theodore could know, effectually,—and that Church which he had found disorganized, divided, a mere assemblage of 'isolated missions,' now at least on the way to become a complete and organized Church throughout the land, the foundations of which he had, under God, laid so deep and true, as to be still the groundwork, after almost twelve centuries, of the same one Church of England.¹

¹ The stern Theodore had a tender heart, as Dr. Hook truly infers from Eddius's account of his reconciliation with Wilfrid, qualify that partial friend's statement how we may. The half-dozen lines which we subjoin, and which were appended to a 'presentation copy' of his Penitential, sent to Hæddi, Bishop of Wessex, reveal a like characteristic:—

'Te nunc sancte Speculator,
Verbi Dei digne dator,
Hæddi, pie præsul, precor,
Pontificum ditum decor,
Pro me tuo peregrino,
Preces funde Theodoro.'

We must devote a few words, in conclusion, to express our regret at the present condition of the documentary materials of Anglo-Saxon Church history. They are contained mainly in three works. The *Codex Diplomaticus* of Mr. Kemble, devoted all but exclusively to charters, belongs to Church history only as to one of many subjects illustrated by the endless mine of information there collected. Of course, we do not look to such a work for a complete and critical collection of ecclesiastical documents, as such. Of the other two, the ecclesiastical volume of Mr. Thorpe's 'Anglo-Saxon Laws and Institutes,' although the result of great labour and an enormous advance in critical skill and learning upon all its predecessors, and containing a large proportion of valuable matter not before published, is yet open to two objections. We do not understand upon what principle it admits or excludes documents. And whatever be that principle, the result is, that it contains but a portion of those which exist,—if all the Laws, yet only *some* of the Penitentials, and only *some* of the Councils, and nothing besides. And further, while professing to publish (for the first time) the genuine Penitential of Theodore, in addition to that of Egbert, it does, in effect, do neither. The omission, indeed, of that which is supposed to be the most genuine recension (so to call it) of Egbert's work, was, we believe, the result of the unexpected termination of the series of Record publications, and therefore no otherwise Mr. Thorpe's fault than that, of course, the MS. (now still unprinted in the Bodleian Library) should have been used in the editing of the recension which he actually has published. But the fact remains, that we are still without the genuine Egbert, or (to be more correct) without that which is probably the nearest approach to the work as he wrote it. The Penitential of Theodore, so called, we are sorry to say, Mr. Thorpe has only printed *in part* from the Corpus MS. He has omitted, without any real authority in the MS. for so doing, six chapters at the beginning,¹ above a score at the end, and two long passages (quotations) in the middle. And further, although a modern superscription in that MS. calls it Theodore's, and although in substance it no doubt is so, yet, as it stands, we must affirm that it is assuredly not Theodore's. Mr. Thorpe himself took notice that the chapters at which he breaks off could not be Theodore's; and he takes the strange course, in consequence, of cutting off the latter half of what the MS. treats as a single work, instead of drawing the plain inference that the *whole* work was not Theo-

¹ These chapters contain the scriptural basis on which the rules that follow are rested. They are recognised in the rubric at the commencement of the Table of contents; but the headings of the chapters after the first are omitted in that table, which after the rubric begins with the first chapter printed by Mr. Thorpe.

dore's but only a recension of his work, or one founded upon it. And even what Mr. Thorpe has published is as plainly not the great Archbishop's, as that which he omits. The very first chapter in his publication bears upon its face the proof that its writer lived after the conversion of Germany and Saxony, and had himself dwelt for some time in those countries. Whether another form of the Penitential can be found approaching more nearly to the original, is another question; but, as in the former case we certainly have not now the best form of the work of Egbert, so neither, in this, have we the best form of that of Theodore. Moreover, although the matter is a very difficult one to accomplish, we do not think that Mr. Thorpe's mode of handling these Penitentials conveys an accurate idea of the state of the case. Every bishop thought himself entitled to interpolate and change the provisions of his Penitential almost at his own pleasure; and we have, therefore, some dozen or more MSS. of Penitentials, differing in arrangement and contents, yet all calling themselves by the names of Theodore, Egbert, or Bede, and all containing much of the same matter or the same words. Mr. Thorpe, in the case of Theodore, has chosen one text—concede for a moment that it is the best—and has thrown the other texts into the shape of various readings in supplementary additions to that one. And this would be well enough, if we had clearly as our groundwork the real book substantially as Theodore or Egbert wrote it, and if the other MSS. agreed in main outline with that chosen as the basis. But neither of these two things is the case. We have merely a set of different recensions (so to call them) by different hands, varying to every possible degree in arrangement and contents. And the point is to place these different recensions before the reader, without reprinting the same matter over and over again; and yet without conveying the idea that all are so nearly the same as to be capable of being represented by various readings upon one. Want of space, no doubt, was Mr. Thorpe's reason for doing as he has done; and we are by no means clear that a better plan is even possible; but at any rate he should have fairly warned us how the matter actually stood. Moreover, there are some foreign MSS. of the so-called Bede's Penitential, which have been printed by Kunstmann since Mr. Thorpe's book was published, and which, therefore, he was of course unable to use.

We turn, then, still to Wilkins's 'Concilia,' as to the only repertory of our native ecclesiastical documents professing to include them all. It need hardly be said to any one who has examined the work, with what utter dissatisfaction an inquirer will turn away from the huge but undigested and inaccurate folios. It was a great work for its time, but in the present state

of both knowledge and criticism it has become contemptible. A writer who prefers the testimony of Matthew of Westminster, or a preposterous fable out of Nennius, to the account of a contemporary biography of the fifth century, who believes in Bale (Dr. Hook, we fear, is still within the shadow of a like darkness), who tumbles into his heap, as of equal value, the contents of a legendary life of the tenth century, and of the '*Liber Landavensis*,' and of the letters of Pope Gregory, and of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and of the Appendix to Edward the Confessor's Laws (which contains the letter of Eleutherius to Lucius and a marvellous Pambritannic Council under Ina), and of the Magdeburg Centuriators,—a writer, in short, who lived while the delusion still lasted of believing almost alike whatever was found in print or MS., irrespective of dates or other circumstances affecting the witness's credibility,—a writer, again, who is so troubled with oscitancy, that, when printing under their several alleged dates a series of letters, produced in a lump, and under very suspicious circumstances, by Archbishop Lanfranc in 1072, he, by mere inadvertence, omits two of the series altogether, and places the others on the same footing with letters of undoubted genuineness,—a writer, lastly, whom Anglo-Saxon scholars rank indeed among the giants of his time for Anglo-Saxon lore, but add further, and prove by the most ludicrous examples, that his knowledge was quite incapable of saving him from the strangest of blunders in translating an Anglo-Saxon document,—such a writer must certainly have produced a book largely capable of improvement, even with respect to the materials which he actually has accumulated. And when the enormous increase of knowledge and of accessibility of MSS. is taken into account, it is obvious that the amount of materials which have escaped his knowledge must be likewise great. His ideas of arrangement also are singular. Three or four letters picked out of a series at random, and printed in an order not chronological, for the text, and the rest (nor quite all of these) thrust into an appendix,—such is his treatment of Pope Gregory's English letters. A heap of so-called Councils of the diocese of Llandaff, bundled all together at one date (to which possibly two of them belong), because there happen to be no Anglo-Saxon documents of that particular period,—a lump of narrative out of Eddius, undigested and out of its chronological place, from which we are to make out for ourselves the closing events of the great Wilfrid contest,—one, and that the most easily accessible, out of three documents touching the Easter controversy, the letter to King Naitan, printed straight from Bede, while those of Columbanus and (still more inexcusably) Aldhelm are omitted,—such are specimens of the order of the

first half (the Saxon portion) of Wilkins's first volume. Of accuracy of texts we will say nothing. We have confined ourselves to the choice and arrangement of the documents themselves. Certainly, it is not to the credit of our historical or our ecclesiastical literature, that such should be the disorderly, incorrect, incomplete, and undigested condition of the great and standard collection of proofs and illustrations of the history of the English Church.¹

¹ We take the opportunity of referring to the intended publication, not so much of a new edition of Wilkins, as of a work on the basis of his, which is said to be contemplated by the Clarendon Press. It is to be hoped that when it appears it may be worthy of the advanced state of ecclesiastical knowledge, and of its subject, and of the University which fitly undertakes it.

ART. V.—*The Influence of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament upon the Progress of Christianity.* By the REV. RALPH CHURTON, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Macmillan. 1861.

MR. CHURTON was the successful competitor for the Hulsean Prize Essay in 1859, but it is seldom that a prize essay is of much importance to the public. It is generally creditable to the author, applauded in the Senate House at Cambridge, or the Theatre at Oxford, and then it passes into 'the tomb of all the Capulets,' where all temporary things are forgotten. But we confidently predict a longer existence to Mr. Churton's Essay. It is composed of materials which the public, at least the Church of England, will not willingly 'let slip.' It is written on a subject full of interest, and also full of novelty. We will not speak of it, as the discoveries of Livingstone, '*loca nullius ante trita solo*;' but we believe that it is a region of Church history seldom visited, and little explored. How few of us have seriously contemplated that, for more than 300 years, the entire Christian Church could read the Old Testament only through the spectacles of the LXX. How few of us consider that this Greek Version was the forerunner of Christ and Christianity, by preparing the highway in the desert for the Gentiles! How seldom do we reflect, that it brought up 'the Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia (Pro-consular), Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in parts of Libya about Cyrene, the strangers of Rome, the proselytes, Cretes and Arabians,' to be miraculously baptized by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and to constitute the original nucleus of the Christian Church!

But if such were its comprehensive external influence in preparing the world for the advent of Messiah, how much greater and more important, how enduring and everlasting is its subjective influence on the language and doctrines of the New Testament! There is not a single versicle from Matthew to the Apocalypse which does not give evidence to the mint of the Pharos. There is not a doctrinal term which is not taken from its phraseology. What are *πίστις, μετάνοια, λύτρωσις, σωτηρία, καταλλαγή*,¹ *ἀγιασμός, δικαιοσύνη, κ.τ.λ.*, but the doctrinal treasures of the Septuagint?

¹ Perhaps, *καταλλαγή* may be thought an exception, as it does not occur in the LXX. in a doctrinal sense. But whoever will consult 2 Macc. i. 5, vi. 20, vii. 33, viii. 29, will be fully convinced of its doctrinal acceptance by the Hellenists. We have cited it, to evince the great importance of the apocryphal books as an appendix to the Canonical Scriptures.

We rejoice to find a Fellow of King's, an Etonian *alumnus*, forgetting awhile Ciceronian Latin and Greek iambs, to investigate the semi-barbarisms of the Hellenistic dialect, by collating these sympathies of thoughts and language. We had been apprehensive lest Mr. Jowett should have found no rival in Septuagintal erudition. But we are satisfied that the time has come for reinstating the Septuagint in the same rank which it held in the Primitive Church. The days of Spearman and the Hutchinsonians have already passed away. The unnatural attempts of Hebrew critics to depreciate the LXX. are now justly discountenanced. We can now perceive that every blow which is aimed at the Greek Version recoils on the Greek of the New Testament.

Mr. Churton commences his Essay with a masterly sketch of the extent to which the Greek language prevailed in the world at the time of the Christian era. He shows amongst the five great empires, it was that of the Greeks which was chosen by Providence to be chiefly instrumental in introducing that spiritual 'kingdom which shall never be destroyed.' The Babylonian and Persian empires ministered partly to this object in God's great economy; but the work assigned to them seems to be more in close connexion with the Jewish Church; whilst the third and fourth empires are far more important in their relation to the calling of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ. Hence 'it was to the nation out of which the third great empire arose, that God assigned the part of providing a universal language for extending the intellect of man so as to enable him to appreciate the truths of Divine Revelation.'—P. 11.

It was that peculiar dialect of Greek which we term Macedonic or Hellenistic, which was ordained to become the special vehicle for bringing the Gentiles into a knowledge of the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament. This was effected principally by the conquests of Alexander, who personally visited Jerusalem, and whose armies contained a large number of Jewish proselytes. Alexandria was founded to succeed the commercial cities of Tyre and Sidon, whose ports were already injured by progressive accumulations of sand. The Jews formed a considerable part of its population, and they naturally desired that their Scriptures should be translated into their vernacular language. The Ptolemies, to whom Egypt had fallen in the partition of Alexander's conquests, gladly favoured their desires, and assigned chambers in the Pharos for the completion of their labours.

They had MSS. sent from Jerusalem, and they executed their task just as might have been expected. It was Macedonic Greek, conjoined to Hebraic idioms—that wondrous fusion of

Greek and Hebrew which we term Hellenistic, and which forms the characteristic style of the New Testament. We claim no direct inspiration for the Version, further than it is identified with the language of the evangelists and apostles. But no man can read the history of the Septuagint, without believing that the God of Moses and the Prophets assisted their endeavours.

Such was the universal conviction of the Christian Church during the first three centuries. It was not till the days of Jerome that any voice was raised against the canonical authority of the Greek Version. An unhappy controversy then arose between Jerome and Augustine, the echoes of which are still reverberating on our ears. That it was a great blessing to recover in some degree the knowledge of the Hebrew, and to read it in the Latin Vulgate, can never be questioned; but the blessing should have been acknowledged, without any attempt to disparage the Version. Had there been no schism between the Eastern and the Western Church, perhaps, this controversy would have gradually subsided. But it was unfortunately revived at the era of the Reformation, and the school of Geneva has been always distinguished for its depreciation of the LXX.

There are two aspects for viewing the Septuagint. The one by considering it merely as a version; and here it must always hold a secondary rank. The other, by considering it as the mighty instrument for the conversion of the Gentiles, and the authoritative dictionary of the New Testament. Whatever external inferiority it may possess as a Version, is more than compensated by its subjective influence on Christianity. Ask, *e.g.* at the present moment, whether it be the Hebrew or the Greek text which exercises the greater dominion over Christianity? But we forbear contrasts. We only desire peace and harmony—'That which God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'

It is on this indissoluble alliance of the New Testament with the Septuagint, that Mr. Churton has constructed his admirable Essay.¹ He has ingeniously selected the Constantinopolitan Creed for the vehicle of his doctrinal illustrations, by enabling him to assemble all the leading doctrinal terms of the New Testament in a short compass. He collates these with similar

¹ There is but one point on which we differ from Mr. Churton, and that is on the Septuagintal origin of the Psalms in our English Prayer Book. Whoever turns to the 14th Psalm, will be at once convinced of this fact. Our translators have frequently modified the version to meet the Hebrew text; but they have left indelible traces of its origin. In their Hebrew order of the Psalms, they only followed the ancient Anglo-Saxon version, which gives the same Hebraic order, but which scrupulously adheres to the Septuagintal interpretation. Thus 'Kiss the son' is rendered *ἡρπῆς δὲ πατρὸς* ('apprehendite disciplinam.' Vulg.). It is well known that every national Psalter, except the *Gallican*, follows the LXX, as derived from the usage of the Primitive Church.

terms in the LXX. and shows they are exactly identical. His Essay is short, and therefore it contains but a small sample of a great multitude. But it is sufficient to prove the point at issue, and also to whet the appetite to enlarge the inquiry. We heartily wish that a doctrinal lexicon of the New Testament on this principle was published for the use of the younger clergy. It would prove an effectual barrier against rationalistic interpretations.

We think that we cannot better conclude this brief notice of Mr. Churton's Essay, than in his own comprehensive summary: 'It has been the intention, in the words above instanced, to give 'the most important examples of the influence of the language 'of the Alexandrian version. In some cases, the forms 'adopted may be merely Hebrew idioms literally rendered 'by the interpreters. But many of the expressions there 'introduced into the Greek language are sanctioned by the 'Inspired teacher of the Truth, as being the nearest approach 'which human language could make to a true description of 'the deep mysteries of the Divine Nature, and of man's 'relation to God. These mysteries, as they transcend all 'understanding, are even still more removed from the grasp 'of language, which is the expression of thought. But by 'the combination of idioms of the Hebrew and Greek tongues '(of which the dispersion of the Jews was by the providence of 'God the immediate occasion), a language was produced of that 'rich and copious nature which Christian doctrine required, to 'enable men to comprehend what is the depth and length and 'breadth and height of the love of Christ, which passeth 'knowledge.'—P. 119. 'In this sense, the Hellenistic dialect 'was one of the chosen means by which God declares the 'truths of the Gospel to man.'—P. 21.

As the theme of Mr. Churton's Hulsean Essay was proposed by the Trustees for the year 1859, it could not have entered into their design to counteract the influence of the 'Essays and Reviews.' Yet a more effective refutation of their sceptical teachings concerning Divine Inspiration, and more especially of Mr. Jowett's 'free and easy' treatment of the doctrinal language of the New Testament, has not yet appeared, nor is likely to appear hereafter. *It is the more unanswerable, because it was not intended as an answer.* It almost corresponds to what mathematicians mean by *superior position*. The doctrinal terminology of the LXX. is placed over against the doctrinal terminology of the Gospels and Epistles, and it is found exactly of the same dimensions. We think that the *Verbal* Inspiration of the New Testament was never before so accurately, so *ocularly*, ascertained and demonstrated.

ART. VI.—1. *Œuvres inédites de Monsieur Dufriche-Desgenettes, Curé de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, à Paris, Fondateur de l'Archiconfrérie du saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie, pour la conversion des Pécheurs; contenant ses Sermons, Prônes, Instructions, Plans et Notes sur divers sujets de la Religion, précédées d'une Notice biographique, d'un Portrait de l'Auteur et d'un autographe de sa main.* Publiées sous la direction de M. l'Abbé G. DESFOSSÉS, Vicaire de la Paroisse. Paris: Librairie du Saint-Cœur de Marie de A. Levesque.

For many years M. Desgenettes occupied a high position among the French clergy. At the period of his death, he was perhaps the most eminent and conspicuous parish priest in France. The famous Association he established, the many works of charity he promoted or organized, his habits of free intimacy with some of the greatest men in his country, his extensive relations and influence, the extraordinary honours that were paid him, the patriarchal age he attained, with activity unabated and intellect unimpaired, his many Christian virtues, his moral grandeur and reputed sanctity, all contributed to invest him with a degree of eminence and celebrity seldom equalled. Believing that an account of this remarkable man may be interesting and instructive to English readers, we proceed in this paper to give, without attempting minutely to analyse character and feelings, a sketch of his life and chief works of charity, as well as to offer some remarks on his sermons and style of preaching. Though he has scarcely been dead a twelvemonth, some eight or ten accounts of him have already appeared, which, whatever may be their dissimilarity in some respects, possess at least these two interesting features in common,—namely, the lofty eulogiums they pass on M. Desgenettes, and the manner in which they, one and all, though professing to be published independently, frequently recount, in the true French style, the same facts in nearly the same words! Of these biographies, that of M. Desfossés, who was for twelve years his assistant-curate and who attended him at his last moments, and is now the editor of his works, is the most recent, and, though not particularly remarkable for elegance of diction or luminous arrangement of matter, seems the most detailed and the best. His life of M. Desgenettes, included in the four volumes mentioned at the head of this article, we shall therefore chiefly use, adding a few facts here and there about the late

Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, which have reached us from private sources. It is true that strange events are sometimes recorded, and startling demands occasionally made on our faith, but we must recollect that marvels are always to be met with in the best authenticated of ultramontanist biographies.

Charles-Eléonore Dufrique-Desgenettes was born at Alençon, on the 10th August, 1778. His family, which was one of great antiquity, had long been settled there, his father and ancestors for several successive generations filling the office—which, especially under the old *régime*, usually descended from father to son—of magistrate in that town. His mother's name is not recorded. She seems to have been an excellent woman, who, from her son's tenderest youth, sedulously endeavoured to instil right principles into his mind. Young Desgenettes did not remain long in his native town. In 1783, his father was appointed *Procureur du Roi* at Sées, and thither the whole family removed.

Macaulay has observed of Johnson, that 'in the child, the physical, intellectual, and moral peculiarities which afterwards distinguished the man, were plainly discernible;¹ and this was in a great measure the case with Desgenettes. He was of a very robust constitution from the first. From the first he decided to devote himself to the work of the priesthood. From the first, also, he displayed great acuteness, ardour, earnestness, and intellectual activity; he was, likewise, extremely high-minded, sensitive, and enthusiastic. But his good qualities were accompanied by an impetuosity and an intractableness, a spirit of self-will and obstinacy, a pertinacity of opinion, a *fougue* and a *brusquerie*, which gave much anxiety to his mother, and which, to his latest day, the man found it difficult to shake off completely. "Plutôt qu'il meure!" s'écriait sa mère, dans la ferveur de sa tendresse alarmée,' says one of his biographers.²

'Ses inquiétudes,' he continues, 'ses remontrances faisaient une vive impression sur son fils, qui la chérissait; il prodiguait les plus belles et les plus sincères promesses, allait devant un petit autel, qu'il avait élevé dans la maison, réciter le *Miserere* dans les sentiments d'un profond repentir, s'assurait qu'il était devenu un homme nouveau, chantait le *Te Deum* en actions de grâces de sa conversion, et recommençait le lendemain à affliger sa bonne mère par ses méfaits enfantins!'

This portrait is quite characteristic of Desgenettes, and

¹ *Biographies*, p. 77.

² M. de Valette. He was for the long period of thirty-two years the intimate friend of M. Desgenettes, and sometime Sub-Director of the *Archiconfrérie du très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie*. He is now Chaplain of the Lycée Napoléon, and Honorary Canon of Digne.

thoroughly French. The *petit autel* here mentioned is one which he himself had constructed. On this altar the image of the Blessed Virgin occupied a prominent place. He used to decorate it with the choicest flowers, and to say his prayers before it.

M. de Valette says truly that no sooner was he forgiven than he recommenced his misdoings. On one occasion, his Confessor having reproved him somewhat severely, the following curious dialogue took place:—

“Que voulez-vous devenir enfin?” says the priest.

“Ce que je veux devenir? mais ce que vous êtes,” answered the child unhesitatingly.

“Vous, mon enfant?”

“Oui, moi. Je veux être prêtre.”

“Dans ce cas, vous avez bien à faire avant de songer à devenir prêtre. Il faut d’abord songer à vous corriger.”

“Eh bien, je me corrigerai.”—Vol. i. p. vi.

He also showed a remarkable precocity. When only three years old he could read well. At six, a somewhat early age for a French youth, he commenced learning Latin, and at seven was put into the fifth class of the college at Séz, where he greatly distinguished himself. His moral improvement, however, scarcely kept pace with his intellectual cultivation and attainments. At the age of twelve, he was the same wayward, intractable, headstrong boy he had ever been. The period had now arrived at which he ought to receive his first Communion. ‘Mais, d’accord avec sa mère,’ says M. Desfossés, ‘ses maîtres voulurent tenter un suprême effort sur ce caractère indomptable. Il fut donc résolu qu’il ne serait admis à la Table sainte que six semaines après ses condisciples.’ This proved a source of great humiliation to young Desgenettes, and it is said it produced a beneficial and permanent effect upon him.

In 1791, the *Procureur du Roi* of Séz was appointed, first of all, Judge, and, subsequently, President of the tribunal of Dreux. When M. Desgenettes removed to Dreux he entered his son at the College of Chartres. Here, as at Séz, young Desgenettes applied himself to his studies with great diligence, and was a great favourite both with his masters and his school-fellows. A curious occurrence, related by most of his biographers, and strikingly illustrative of the youth’s religious principles, must not be omitted here. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, as it is called, had recently been decreed by the National Assembly. It was at this time the custom for the pupils in the Government colleges to go to confession; but the college confessor, like all the rest of the clergy who were allowed to exercise the functions of their office, was, of course, a *prêtre assermenté*. His name

was Vitalis,¹ and he was Vicar-General to the *de facto* Bishop of Chartres, Mgr. Bonnet. Now, young Desgenettes, regarding all priests who had taken the oath as intruders and schismatics, determined not to confess to M. Vitalis; and in this resolution he was confirmed by the advice of some clergymen, intimate friends of his family, and who themselves had refused to take the oath. To confession, however, the college regulations compelled him to go. He himself has narrated what passed on that occasion between the Abbé Vitalis and himself:—

“ Arrivé aux pieds du confesseur, je dus faire comme mes condisciples. Je me mis à genoux, mais je restai bouche close. Alors, entre M. Vitalis et moi, eut lieu le dialogue suivant :

“ Mais dites donc votre *Confiteor*, mon ami.”

“ Monsieur, je ne dis pas de *Confiteor*.”

“ Et pourquoi donc, s’il vous plaît ? ”

“ Parce que je ne viens pas ici de mon plein gré, mais emmené de force par la règle. Je ne me confesse pas, moi, aux prêtres assermentés. Vous n’êtes pas catholique.”

“ Vous, encore un enfant, vous vous croyez donc capable de décider de pareilles questions, des questions si graves ? Vous croyez donc en savoir à ce sujet plus que moi, plus que mes confrères, plus que M. Bonnet lui-même, notre Evêque ? Allons, enfant, confessez-vous.”

“ Je vous répète que je ne veux pas me confesser à vous ; car vous n’avez pas de pouvoirs. M. Bonnet, que vous appelez votre Evêque d’ Eure-et-Loire, n’a pas plus de pouvoir que vous ; il ne peut donc pas vous en donner ; il n’est pas plus évêque que moi, il n’est qu’un intrus.”

“ Mais savez-vous que vous manquez de respect aux autorités établies ? ”

“ Vous vous trompez, Monsieur. Je vénère, au contraire, l’autorité, la seule autorité qui existe dans l’Eglise de Jésus-Christ. Si je vous tiens ce langage qui semble vous blesser, c’est parce que notre Saint-Père le Pape, dans son bref du 13 Avril, ordonne aux ecclésiastiques qui ont prêté le serment de le retracter, et déclare que les élections, ainsi que la consécration des nouveaux évêques, sont illégitimes, sacrilèges, et par conséquent nulles.”

“ Où en sommes-nous donc maintenant pour que des écoliers viennent nous citer des brefs ? Vous avez donc des relations avec la cour de Rome ? ”

“ Vous en avez bien, vous, avec la cour de Satan ! . . . ”

“ A ces mots, piqué au vif, M. Vitalis me congédia.”—Vol. i. pp. ix. x.

This was pretty well for a stripling of thirteen ! Here the discussion ended, as well it might ! We will here chronicle another event which occurred while young Desgenettes was at the College of Chartres, and which, again, forcibly illustrates a prominent feature in his character, and shows that he was as rigid in the maintenance of his political as of his religious convictions. 1793 had arrived. The King had been guillotined on the 21st January, and his death had produced such an impression upon Desgenettes that his health had suffered in consequence. The College vacations were about to take place, and the

¹ M. Vitalis, an excellent man *d’ailleurs*, afterwards recanted, and died Curé of Saint-Eustache in Paris.

prizes distributed; while young Desgenettes' own scholastic career was drawing to a close. As is always the case, there was a large gathering on the occasion. The very *élite* of the population of Chartres had met in the former Church of the Cordeliers, now transformed into a museum, to witness the imposing spectacle. The Government commissioner, Jean-Bon-Saint-André,¹ occupied the president's chair. A dead silence prevailed while the names of the different laureats were announced. Charles Desgenettes had obtained the prize for Latin translation. His father's high position, the respect in which his family was held, and his own college successes—everything combined to draw the particular attention of the company present upon young Desgenettes. All eyes were fixed on him as he left his place, and went up to the platform. Already, the president was preparing to crown young Desgenettes, to congratulate him on his success, and—to embrace him! But we will allow M. Desfossés to speak:—

‘Au lieu de se diriger vers lui, Charles s’arrête tout à coup sur les bords de l’estrade, en face de la nombreuse assemblée qui suit des yeux chacun de ses mouvements. D’une main, il tient sa couronne, de l’autre, son prix. Il salue, en s’inclinant devant l’assistance, et se retire sans daigner jeter même un regard sur le président. Ce mode nouveau de recevoir une couronne surprend et étonne d’abord, mais on comprend aussitôt. Les élèves frappent de nombreux applaudissements, suivis de ceux des nouveaux assistants. Un murmure unanime d’admiration couronne la hardiesse du vainqueur. Jean Bon sent vivement le trait qui lui est lancé. Mais il a du tact, il se contente donc de se venger, par un sourire de dédain et par une distraction, chaque fois que le hardi jeune homme vient recevoir un nouveau prix.’—Vol. i. pp. xi. xii.

Like many other enthusiastic minds, M. de Desgenettes had hailed the Revolution with joy, but he soon became disgusted with its follies and its crimes. After the death of the king, the prefect of Eure-et-Loir exacted the adhesion of all the magistrates of the department to the sentence of the Convention. M. Desgenettes refused his, and resigned his office. In 1794, he was accused of disaffection to the government, and three commissioners of the Committee of Public Safety, accompanied by gendarmes and some members of the revolutionary committee of Dreux, went to his house to arrest him. Not finding him at home, they wished to retain Madame Desgenettes as security. ‘Arrêtez-moi,’ exclaimed young Desgenettes, ‘si vous croyez la liberté d’une femme dangereuse à la république, mais laissez libres ces enfants que la prison tuerait.’ The house was searched,

¹ The well-known member of the Committee of Public Safety, and friend of Robespierre. This worthy, it will be remembered, proposed in the National Convention the condemnation and death of Louis XVI. without any form of legal proceeding!

and all M. Desgenettes' papers, letters, &c. were examined. Nothing, however, was discovered of a nature to compromise the family, in spite of the perspicacity of one of the commissioners, a grocer at Dreux, who, perceiving a manuscript copy of Machiavel's maxims, exclaimed with delight: 'Nous tenons 'notre affaire! . . . Qui est ce Machiavel? Il est bien sûr dans 'la Vendée!'

On M. Desgenettes' return home, he was seized and thrown into prison. Young Desgenettes at once determined to effect his release. On the 4th August, 1794, he attended a meeting of the club at Dreux, and harangued the tumultuous assemblage, telling them among other things:—

'Vous êtes le peuple souverain, et, en votre présence, on vient arracher à votre amour votre père, votre époux! Voyez combien de familles sont dans le deuil! Et quel crime ont-ils commis, ceux qu'on tient ainsi captifs?...Levez-vous donc, il est temps. Que la honte d'une soumission aussi basse que coupable ne souille plus vos fronts. Rendez donc à la liberté et à leur famille ces hommes nombreux que vous aimiez à voir au milieu de vous, que vous environniez de votre estime, que vous appelez vos frères. Oui, c'est l'heure, levez-vous, et la ville entière acclamera votre courage.'—Vol. i. p. xiv.

Charles Desgenettes was vehemently applauded. A commission composed of twenty members of the club, and presided over by himself, was at once named for the opening of the prisons; and in a few moments M. Desgenettes and a hundred and fifty other heads of families were restored to liberty.

We will not stop to recount the strange vicissitudes and perilous adventures of young Desgenettes, from his fifteenth year to the period when he was admitted to the priesthood—his dangerous illness and extraordinarily sudden recovery—how, both at Dreux and at Saint-Lomer, he used to leave home at night and seek out those priests who had refused the oaths to the Constitution in their obscure retreats for the purpose of relieving them—how he opened a school for the gratuitous education and catechising of the children of the poor—how, when the reign of terror was at its height, he was accustomed to *faire le prêtre*, holding, both at his own home and in the suburbs of Dreux and Saint-Lomer, religious meetings and explaining the Scriptures—how, on one occasion, he put himself at the head of large crowds of women, presented himself before the Government Commissioner, and demanded the reopening of those churches that had been closed—and how, finally, he was summoned before the Prefect¹ at Alençon, accused *de faire le*

¹ Curiously enough, this same Prefect became later one of M. Desgenettes' parishioners at Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. They met, and the quondam Prefect thus addressed the Curé:—'Vous étiez un brave jeune homme; je vous tracassais ainsi, parce que j'avais reçu des ordres supérieurs, mais je vous estimais intérieure-

prêtre, of being a *chouan*, and so forth. From his most tender years, as we have seen, Charles Desgenettes had decided upon taking orders. His father, however, who had now become a judge at the tribunal of Mortagne, wished him to follow his own profession, but for this young Desgenettes had a strong aversion. He then prevailed upon Charles to take to medicine like his cousin,¹ which he did; but, after a six months' study, he gave it up, and prepared himself for the priesthood. For this purpose, he entered the Seminary of Séez, in 1803. The first Consul had successfully terminated his negotiations with the Pope, the Concordat passed into a law, and the Christian religion was now re-established throughout France. On the 9th June, 1805, Desgenettes was ordained priest. The day after his ordination he was appointed Curé of Saint-Lomer and *vicaire* of Courtomer. Eight months afterwards, he was transferred, to the great regret of his parishioners, to the assistant curacy of Argentan, to which was soon added that of S. Martin's. In 1811, M. de Fontanes, the *grand-maitre* of the University of France, established three years before by Napoleon, offered the Abbé Desgenettes the principalship of the College of Séez, which, in consequence of the many difficulties that stood in the way, he felt compelled to decline. Whilst at Argentan, the Abbé lost his excellent mother, whom he had left at Courtomer. As soon as he had been apprised of her illness, he had hastened to see her; and their last interview was very affecting. He himself performed the funeral service. He has left on record a strange account of how, after her death, eight days before the Feast of the Assumption, he heard her call to him several times, '*Desgenettes! Desgenettes!*' On the eve of the Assumption, she herself appeared to one of his Curé's servants, who had already heard her voice, on the same occasion as the Abbé, and seen her. Let us hear the Abbé's own account of her apparition:—

'Huit jours après, la veille de l'Assomption, elle est encore réveillée, en sursaut, par un bruit de voix. Elle regarde, et me voit assis, à côté de la même dame qu'elle avait vue huit jours auparavant. Voici ce que cette dame me disait: *Desgenettes, sois entièrement tranquille sur mon sort, car, aujourd'hui même, Dieu m'a fait grâce. Rassure-toi aussi sur les messes qui m'ont été confiées par ta tante Lefebvre. J'ai remis ces messes à M. S..., curé de X..., à l'abbé de B..., à M. L..., à M. D..., et à M. B.... Quant à la sœur Des-*

ment.' M. Desgenettes answered him, smiling:—'*Vous me faisiez la guerre, mais c'était une guerre bon chat bon rat, car je vous tenais tête.*' This man, for a long period an infidel, became converted under the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires's ministrations.

¹ M. Desgenettes was, if we mistake not, first cousin to the celebrated physician of the same name, Nicolas-René Dufriche-Desgenettes, a great favourite of Napoleon I. and created baron by him.

champs, je lui devais 37 livres et 10 sous, mais elle est allée trouver ton père à Mortagne, et il l'a payée aujourd'hui même. Les sacrifices que tu as faits pour moi à l'heure de la mort, m'ont beaucoup servi devant Dieu.—Vol. i. p. xlii.

His father soon followed his mother to the grave. On hearing of his dangerous illness, the Abbé went immediately to Mortagne, and found his father insensible. He, however, rallied a few moments after, and confessed to his son. An hour afterwards, he expired. The Abbé again performed the funeral service. The judge had, at one period of his life, imbibed the infidel opinions then so prevalent, but had since recanted them; and, not long before his death, he had written a most touching letter to his son, full of the noblest religious sentiments.

Whilst at Argentan, the Abbé Desgenettes gave his undivided attention to the care of his flock and to the instruction of youth. An instance of his thorough self-devotion and high moral fortitude in a trying emergency, which occurred towards the conclusion of his ministry in that town, is recorded by his biographers. It is a more pleasing, as well as better authenticated and more credible narrative than that of his Curé's servant girl:—

'L'année de 1813 touchait à sa fin,' says M. Desfossés, 'lorsqu'on vit arriver, à Argentan, un nombreux dépôt de blessés et de prisonniers de guerre. Un ancien couvent fut assigné pour leur servir, à la fois, d'hôpital et de prison. Une inexcusable incurie imposa bientôt à ces malheureux le supplice de la faim. Le cœur de l'abbé Desgenettes fut navré de douleur, au récit de leur misère. Un jour qu'il vit lui même plusieurs de ces infortunés captifs, tendre aux enfants, par les fenêtres, leurs mains suppliantes, et implorer du pain, ils se rendit sur la place publique, auprès d'un officier de gendarmerie, lui adressa justes reproches, discuta, demanda et obtint son entrée libre dans la prison. Muni de cette autorisation, il se rendit aussitôt au couvent, emportant avec lui les secours les plus nécessaires. Bientôt il sut intéresser à son œuvre toutes les âmes charitables, et organiser des quêtes.

'Mais le cœur du prêtre eut à supporter les émotions les plus préribles, comme aussi il put recueillir les plus grandes consolations au milieu de tant de douleurs.

'Les prisonniers étaient entassés les uns sur les autres. Le typhus se déclara. Les morts s'amoncelèrent. C'est alors que l'abbé Desgenettes redoubla de zèle et d'activité. Parmi tous ces Allemands, il avait découvert un officier hongrois qui parlait latin. Il en fit son interprète. Impossible de dire la joie de tous ces malheureux, décimés chaque jour si impitoyablement par la mort, à l'arrivée de leur généreux et infatigable ami. Sur son passage, tous faisaient le signe de la croix et récitaient quelques prières, afin de se faire reconnaître catholiques. A chacun le bon prêtre adressait une bonne parole, un secours. Il entendait les confessions. Il se multiplait partout, et luttait, par son zèle, avec la maladie et la mort.'—Vol. i. pp. xlv. xlv.

But soon M. Desgenettes himself caught the disease. For three weeks he lay at death's door. During the whole time, as he had often done before under the same circumstances, he refused to see a doctor; 'il connaissait par expérience la toute

puissance de Dieu.' He eventually recovered, but with the partial loss of his memory, which before was a remarkably retentive one.¹

Meanwhile the Abbé was about to leave Argentan. Napoleon had quarrelled with the Pope, who was now a captive at Fontainebleau, and who refused canonical institution to the bishops named by the emperor. In this emergency, the government had instructed the diocesan chapters to invest the bishops whom they had nominated with the authority of capitular vicars-general. The Pope had formally protested against these uncanonical proceedings, and a schism was again imminent. Such was the state of things in the French Church, when M. Baton, canon and vicar-general of Rouen, was appointed Bishop of Séz. Most of the clergy of the diocese refused to acknowledge him. Under these circumstances, they resolved to send a deputation to the Pope, to lay before him the state of the diocese, and to know what was to be done; and M. Desgenettes was chosen for that purpose. He had an interview with the Abbé Della Rocca, who put him into communication with Cardinal Gabrielli. The Cardinal was so much struck with the Abbé Desgenettes, that he at once appointed him apostolical administrator of the diocese of Séz. The Abbé, however, declined the proffered dignity; upon this he was asked by the Cardinal whom he considered the fittest person in the diocese, for that office; and M. Desgenettes named the Abbé Levavasseur, who was forthwith appointed. M. Baton was greatly irritated when he heard of what had been done, and doubtless the Abbé Desgenettes would have been severely punished for the share he had taken in these proceedings had not the Bourbons returned. We need hardly say that the Abbé hailed their re-establishment on the throne with great joy; but this joy was to be of short duration. On Napoleon's return from Elba, the Abbé was obliged to flee. Had he not fled, he would have been arrested and taken to Vincennes. He escaped to Caen, and there concealed himself in the house of an intimate friend. At the end of the Hundred Days we find him in Paris, anxious to become a member of the Society of Jesus. He was, however, dissuaded from taking this step by the famous Jesuit, the Père de la Clorivière, who told him that his sphere of duty was elsewhere, and who, as his biographer informs us with great solemnity, predicted that he should become curé in a parish where he would have much to endure, and then be removed to

¹ This failure of his memory may partly account for the fact noticed by Dr. Wordsworth, in his *Diary in France* (p. 199), namely, the Abbé ever and anon, while preaching, 'taking a pinch of snuff to gain a little time for thought, and to stimulate his ideas;' though it is well known he was an inveterate snuff-taker.

Paris. The parish thus prophetically announced, was Montsort, a suburb of Alençon, to which the Abbé was presented in 1816, and where he remained four years. In another respect, the Jesuit's prediction was also verified—the Abbé had certainly much to endure there. The inhabitants of Montsort were remarkable for their revolutionary opinions, and commenced by refusing to receive their new curé, whose strong legitimist principles were well known to them; and they would even have prevented his installation had it not been for the gendarmerie. By his devotion, self-denial, and zeal for the interests of his people, he soon contrived to gain the goodwill of many; nevertheless, he continued to the end to have many enemies, and to be subjected to many *tracasseries*. At length an event occurred which necessitated the abandonment of his cure. We give it in M. Desfossés' words. It not only serves to illustrate the truth of Father de la Clorivière's prophecy, as the biographer reminds us repeatedly in the course of his narrative, but also how, both civilly and ecclesiastically, things are occasionally managed in France. French ultramontanists are fond of representing the Anglican Church as the creature and slave of the State; but people little know how much this is the case with the French Church, and how the French clergy, both beneficed and unbeneficed, are too often in a state of abject dependence, not only upon their Bishops, but also upon the civil authorities, and especially upon the minister of Public Worship.

'Un jour de fête,' says M. Desfossés, 'à l'office des vêpres, en présence du Très-Saint Sacrement exposé, le saint Curé aperçoit une dame qui, par sa tenue irrévérencieuse, troublait le recueillement et la piété des fidèles. Il envoie le bedeau la rappeler poliment à l'ordre. Au lieu d'obtempérer à une si juste demande, la dame s'irrite et redouble ses irrévérences. Alors, l'abbé Desgenettes, qui s'aperçoit du désordre sacrilège qu'elle occasionne dans le saint lieu, se recueille un instant, et prie. Puis, l'interpellant lui-même avec modération, il la conjure de mettre fin à ses propos ou de sortir. Le démon qui a soufflé l'irrévérence souffle aussitôt la vengeance dans le cœur de cette femme. Elle s'empare jusqu'aux injures, et court raconter à son mari que le curé l'a insultée, en pleine église, et a voulu l'assassiner. Le mari irrité va aussitôt trouver ceux qu'il connaît être les ennemis implacables du zélé pasteur, parce que l'ignorance et la mauvaise conduite de leurs enfants ne lui ont pas permis de les admettre à la première communion. On décide qu'il faut en finir, et il va déposer au parquet les plaintes de sa femme.

'Cependant, au milieu de la tempête que les passions conjurées de ses ennemis soulevaient contre lui, M. l'Abbé Desgenettes jouissait de la tranquillité que donne une conscience qui a fait son devoir et qui a Dieu pour lui. Un jour, dans une maison amie, il se rencontre avec le président du tribunal; et, la conversation y menant, il lui raconte le fait, tel qu'il est arrivé. Le noble magistrat voit aussitôt combien sa bonne foi a été surprise, et l'assure de sa protection et de sa justice.

'Sur ces entrefaites, le ministre des cultes, trompé par de faux rapports, écrivait à l'évêché pour obtenir la révocation du curé.

‘L’autorité ecclésiastique, qui connaissait le droit du noble persécuté, temporisait, lorsqu’elle reçut une nouvelle lettre du ministre qui rendait pleine justice à M. Desgenettes. Le président du tribunal avait écrit à M. Lainé et l’avait éclairé. L’instruction n’eut donc pas de suite.’—Vol. i. p. lvii.

The Abbé, however, resigned his cure, in spite of his Bishop’s urgent entreaties and remonstrances. It was now his intention to enter the Bon-Sauveur at Caen, but, pressed by a friend whom he accidentally met, he decided to accompany him to Paris, and there he was introduced to M. Desjardins, the eminent curé of the parish des Missions Etrangères, who appointed him one of his assistant curates. Soon afterwards, when the Abbé Desjardins was chosen Vicar-General of Paris by the Archbishop—the Cardinal de Périgord—and was consulted by the Cardinal as to a fit successor, the Abbé strongly recommended M. Desgenettes, who was presented to the cure, and who applied himself with his accustomed energy to the enlarged sphere of duty and weightier responsibilities now devolving upon him. Our space precludes our detailing all that he did in his new capacity. Besides performing with unsurpassed diligence the usual routine of duties, such as receiving confessions, preaching, and so forth, incumbent upon curés, he restored his church and provided for it the requisite ornaments, obtained an augmentation of the salaries of his assistant curates, built schools, established orphanages, and organized various *œuvres*, which are in a very flourishing condition at this day. Among these good works the celebrated *Maison de la Providence*, in the Rue Oudinot, for the reception of female orphans, deserves special mention. The Abbé spent more than 500,000 francs upon it. Since its foundation it has received within its walls some 1,600 girls; and it is conducted on such excellent principles that it has served as a model for several orphanages both in Paris and in the departments. How the Abbé contrived to obtain the necessary funds for carrying out his good works is not explained to us; the sum expended upon them must have been enormous. It is true he had several exalted and munificent friends and patrons, and among them Charles X. and the Duchess of Angoulême. On one occasion the King sent him 30,000 francs for the *Maison de la Providence*, and begged the Abbé to recommend him to the prayers of his orphans. The Abbé was admitted to a *tête-à-tête* with the King several times; and each time he went to the palace Charles told him with a smile, ‘*Eh bien ! mon cher curé ! comment vont vos enfants ?*’

The Curé des Missions Etrangères was on terms of great intimacy with the papal nuncio, Mgr. Lambruschini, who wished to see him promoted to the episcopate. We are told

that the Cardinal went expressly to see the Minister of Public Worship, Mgr. Frayssinous, to ask him for a mitre for his friend. His intervention, however, proved unavailing. 'Telle n'était pas la volonté de Dieu,' says M. Desfossés. 'Le ministre promit; mais le dévouement à toute épreuve de l'Abbé Desgenettes au Saint-Siège, ses sentiments tout à fait ultramontains, l'activité, l'énergie de son zèle, engagèrent le ministre à différer d'en faire la proposition au roi.' We must demur to what the biographer states here as to the Abbé Desgenettes' activity and zeal being, in the eyes of Frayssinous, a bar to his promotion. The Bishop of Hermopolis was not only the most eloquent preacher of the time of the Restoration, but he was also a very high-principled and zealous man; and he would have been the last to obstruct M. Desgenettes' promotion on account of his activity and energy. The real obstacle to the Abbé's advancement was simply his '*tête ardente*' and his violent ultramontanism; and, as a staunch and sincere Gallican, the minister would not promote him to a bishopric.

The Abbé Desgenettes had for some time projected the erection of a larger and handsomer church than the Missions Etrangères, precisely on the spot where the magnificent church of Sainte-Clotilde now stands. The city of Paris could not assist him in consequence of the expense it had recently incurred in the erection of the churches of the Madeleine and Saint Vincent de Paul. Charles X. had, however, promised him large subsidies from his own private purse; and the Abbé was about to take the preliminary steps for the construction of the church when the Revolution of 1830 broke forth. It was an event which inflicted a rude shock upon his political and religious principles, and a deep wound upon his private feelings. At this period he was spending a few days at Montrouge, at the noviciate of the Jesuits, which was sacked by the rabble. He immediately returned to Paris, and is said to have supplied provisions to the royal troops shut up in the barracks of Babylone. On the ensuing October he resigned his cure, and retired to Fribourg.

Various causes have been assigned for his voluntary banishment. It has been said that he had incurred heavy debts in carrying out his various works of charity. It has also been said that he feared the revolutionary mobs. We know in what aversion the clergy of Paris were held for some time after the 'three glorious days.' We know that no ecclesiastic durst show himself in the street without great danger. We know also that, so opposed to religion was the revolutionary frenzy of the period, that the church of Saint-Germain l'Auxerrois was devastated and profaned by the most abominable saturnalia of a ruffianly and atheistic rabble,

and the archiepiscopal palace demolished. We do not, however, think the reasons alleged are the true ones.¹ The Abbé's departure was caused rather by his desire to recruit his broken health, and by an affection for the fallen dynasty whose exile he wished to share. He returned to Paris in May, 1832. Soon after his return the Minister of Public Worship, M. Girod de l'Ain, in spite of M. Desgenettes' strong legitimist opinions, thought of promoting him to the bishopric of Verdun, but the appointment was never carried out. His friends then tried to obtain for him the bishopric of Corsica; but, says M. Desfossés, 'c'était l'heure de la nomination de Dieu.' On the 27th August, 1832, the Archbishop of Paris presented him to the cure of the Church des Petits-Pères, which has since resumed its original name, Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. The Abbé has himself described the state of that parish in his *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*. The picture is not very flattering, though the good Abbé has, possibly, slightly over-coloured it with a view to give more relief to the subsequently improved condition of his parish, and to set off the benefits resulting from his obedience to the supernatural and so unequivocally expressed intimation he is about to receive, and which he himself will relate to us presently.

'Il y a dans Paris, dans cette moderne Babylone qui a infecté le monde entier de tous les venins, de toutes les doctrines de la corruption, de l'impiété, de la révolte et du mensonge; il y a dans Paris une paroisse, alors presque inconnue, même d'un grand nombre de ses habitants. Elle est située entre le Palais-Royal et la Bourse, au centre de la ville; sa ceinture se compose de théâtres et de lieux de plaisirs bruyants et publics. C'est le quartier le plus absorbé par les agitations intéressées de la cupidité et de l'industrie, le plus abandonné aux criminelles voluptés des passions de toute espèce. Son église, dédiée à Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, a perdu son nom avec sa gloire; ou ne la connaît plus que sous le nom sans expression de l'église des *Petits-Pères*. En des temps malheureux elle servit à la bourse. Ce temple restait désert, même aux jours des solennités les plus augustes de la religion. Disons plus, disons tout, quoiqu'il nous en coûte; il était devenu un lieu, un théâtre de prostitution, et nous avons été forcé de recourir à la force publique pour en chasser ceux qui le profanaient. Point de sacrements administrés dans cette paroisse, pas même à la mort. C'est en vain que le prêtre monte dans la chaire pour y rompre le pain de la parole, personne pour l'écouter! Une poignée de

¹ The Abbé's biographers bear uniform testimony to the fearlessness and sang-froid which he displayed during the insurrections of 1848 and 1849, and the *coup-d'état* of 1851, and how, when the bullets were flying in all directions, he was seen traversing the streets and offering his services to such as needed them. One of them, however, takes occasion from this to hint, with beautiful simplicity, that if he did exhibit any pusillanimity during or after the July revolution, his subsequent courage is to be easily accounted for. 'Si on veut expliquer cette conduite par un sentiment de timidité, que démentent d'ailleurs l'humeur de M. Desgenettes et les allures de sa jeunesse, il faudra avouer que, contrairement à ce qui arrive d'habitude, l'énergie de cette âme s'est développée dans la vieillesse, et que sa transformation devant l'autel de Marie a été complète.'—*Le Curé de N.-D. des Victoires*, par Maxime de Mont-Rond. p. 51.

chrétiens, et qui craignaient de le paraître, voilà tout le troupeau. Les autres, absorbés par les calculs de l'intérêt et du gain, ou noyés dans les excès des voluptés et des passions, ne connaissent ni l'église ni le pasteur; et si ce triste pasteur tente d'établir quelques relations avec les âmes qui lui sont confiées, on le dédaigne, on le repousse, on le méprise. Il s'entend dire qu'on *n'a pas besoin de lui*, qu'il n'a qu'à se retirer. Si, à force d'employer des sollicitations étrangères, il obtient d'être admis auprès d'un malade en danger, c'est sous condition d'attendre que le malade ait perdu le sentiment, et encore qu'il ne se présentera qu'en habit séculier. A quoi bon sa visite? *Il ne ferait que tourmenter inutilement le malade. Quant à son habit, on ne veut pas le voir; et puis que dirait-on si l'on voyait entrer un prêtre dans notre maison? on nous prendrait pour des Jésuites.* Voilà le degré de foi et d'esprit religieux de cette paroisse."—*Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*, p. 84.

In a letter addressed to Mgr. de Quélen, soon after his nomination, the Abbé Desgenettes thus completes the picture of his parish:—

"Votre grandeur a daigné me confier la paroisse de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. . . . je ne connais [je connaissais] nullement cette paroisse, je savais à peine où était située son Eglise. Vous me dites, Monseigneur, que c'était une paroisse qui n'en était pas une. Ces paroles me frappèrent, mais je ne m'attendais pas à les trouver si vraies et surtout d'une vérité si étendue. Vous connaissez le genre de population de ce quartier, vous savez combien il est peu religieux, mais ce que vous ignorez sans doute, c'est que la *Gazette des cultes* s'imprimait et se répandait par milliers dans la paroisse, aux derniers jours de la Restauration; que la *Tribune* avait son imprimerie, ses bureaux et son club auprès de mon Eglise; que sept à huit autres journaux impies et immoraux s'imprimaient dans la paroisse; que, pendant les années 1832, 33, 34, et partie de 35, plusieurs loges de carbonaris y étaient établis. . . ; que là, les propos, les discours les plus impies, les plus violents, les propositions les plus atroces, étaient continuellement à l'ordre du jour contre la religion, contre vous, contre moi, et que le misérable S— y promettait hautement de nous assassiner tous les deux. . . . Depuis la révolution de juillet surtout, plus d'administration des sacrements: les malades mouraient sans confession; presque plus de Pâques; l'église était déserte: trente ou quarante personnes à la grand' messe, une douzaine à vêpres, et c'était rare; les prêtres détestés, méprisés, insultés s'ils se trouvaient dans la nécessité de se montrer au dehors avec leur vêtement clérical! Le dimanche qui suivit mon installation était la fête de saint Augustin (un des patrons de l'église). Cette circonstance et un peu la curiosité de voir le nouveau pasteur auraient dû amener quelques personnes à l'église: je ne sais pas si plus de quarante paroissiens assistaient à la grand' messe, mais je comptai à vêpres, au moment du sermon: nous étions trente-huit, en comptant le prédicateur qui ne put s'empêcher d'exprimer son mécontentement. J'essayais de faire des visites; je fus reçu avec une malhonnêteté marquée; on me repoussait en qualité de prêtre."—Vol. i. p. lxxv. lxxvi.

¹ We do not of course wish to depreciate the Abbé's labours, but we must bear in mind that this statement, and other portions of his description of his church and parish, are more or less applicable to the then position of most of the Paris ecclesiasties and the condition of their churches and parishes; though there is no doubt that his own enjoyed a pre-eminent and unenviable notoriety for irreligion and sin. We must also recollect that the revival in religion which has since taken place is not confined to the parish of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, but has extended in a great measure—at least as far as external devotion is concerned—to most churches and parishes in the French capital.

This state of things was a source of intense grief to the Curé. The material condition of the church was on a par with the spiritual condition of the flock—the sacred vessels, the ornaments, the altars were wretched. A month after his installation, he celebrated a service for the repose of his predecessor's soul; the only person who attended was the late Curé's maid-servant! In his embarrassment and anxiety, he tendered his resignation to the Archbishop, but the Archbishop refused to accept it, and told him to stay, or at least recommended delay. He applied himself with greater energy than ever to the amelioration of his parish, and he gave much time to prayer; still there was no material improvement. A few conversions, it is true, took place; but, says M. Desfossés, 'l'église était toujours un désert, dont le vide navrait le cœur du pasteur.' (Vol. i. p. lxxvii.) Thus four whole years elapsed, and matters remained in pretty much the same state. In spite of the Abbé's earnestness and zeal, in spite of his great experience, in spite of his readiness of resource, no sensible change for the better was effected; and thoroughly disheartened and sad, 'à bout de cœur et de persévérance,' and despairing of ever being able to attract people to church, he had determined, notwithstanding his diocesan's earnest solicitations to the contrary, to relinquish his cure, when an unlooked-for and unprecedented change took place. The extraordinary manner in which this extraordinary change was brought about, the Abbé, whose imagination seemed somewhat over-excited at times, and was fond of the marvellous, has himself related in his *Manuel*:—

'Le 3 Décembre, 1836, fête de saint François Xavier, à neuf heures du matin, je commençais la sainte-messe au pied de l'autel de la sainte Vierge, que nous avons depuis consacré à son très-saint et immaculé Cœur et qui est aujourd'hui l'autel de l'Archiconfrérie; j'en étais au premier verset du psaume *Judica me*, quand une pensée vint saisir mon esprit. C'était la pensée de l'inutilité de mon ministère dans cette paroisse; elle ne m'était pas étrangère, je n'avais que trop d'occasions de la concevoir et de me la rappeler. Mais dans cette circonstance elle me frappa plus vivement qu'à l'ordinaire. Comme ce n'était ni le lieu ni le temps de m'en occuper, je fis tous les efforts possibles pour l'éloigner de mon esprit. Je ne pus y parvenir; il me semblait entendre continuellement une voix qui venait de mon intérieur et qui me répétait : *Tu ne fais rien, ton ministère est nul ; vois, depuis plus de quatre ans que tu es ici, qu'as-tu gagné ? Tout est perdu, ce peuple n'a plus de foi. Tu devrais par prudence te retirer.* Et malgré tous mes efforts pour repousser cette malheureuse pensée, elle s'opiniâtra tellement qu'elle absorba tous les facultés de mon esprit, au point que je lisais, je récitais les prières sans plus comprendre ce que je disais; la violence que je m'étais faite m'avait fatigué, et j'éprouvais une transpiration des plus abondantes. Je fus dans cet état jusqu'au commencement du canon de la messe. Après avoir récité le *Sanctus*, je m'arrêtai un instant, je cherchai à rappeler mes idées; effrayé de l'état de mon esprit, je me dis : *Mon Dieu, dans quel état suis-je ? Comment vais-je offrir le divin sacrifice ? Je n'ai pas assez de liberté d'esprit pour consacrer. O mon Dieu, délivrez-moi de cette malheureuse distraction !* A peine

eus-je achevé ces paroles que j'entendis très-distinctement ces mots prononcés d'une manière solennelle : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie*. A peine eus-je entendu ces paroles, qui ne frappèrent point mes oreilles, mais retentirent seulement au dedans de moi, que je recouvrai immédiatement le calme et la liberté de l'esprit. La fatale impression, qui m'avait si violemment agité, s'effaça aussitôt, il ne m'en resta aucune trace. Je continuai la célébration des saints mystères sans aucun souvenir de ma précédente distraction. Après mon action de grâces, j'examinai la manière dont j'avais offert le saint Sacrifice ; alors seulement je me rappelai que j'avais eu une distraction, mais ce n'était qu'un souvenir confus, et je fus obligé de rechercher pendant quelques instants quel en avait été l'objet. Je me rassurai en me disant : *Je n'ai pas péché, je n'étais pas libre*. Je me demandai comment cette distraction avait cessé, et le souvenir de ces paroles que j'avais entendues se présenta à mon esprit. Cette pensée me frappa d'une sorte de terreur. Je cherchais à nier la possibilité de ce fait, mais ma mémoire confondait les raisonnements que je m'objectais. Je bataillai avec moi-même pendant dix minutes. Je me disais à moi-même : *Quelle fatale pensée ! Si je m'y arrêtais, je m'exposerais à un grand malheur, elle affecterait mon moral, je pourrais devenir visionnaire*. Fatigué de ce nouveau combat, je pris mon parti et je me dis : *Je ne puis m'arrêter à cette pensée ; elle aurait de trop fâcheuses conséquences ; d'ailleurs, c'est une illusion : j'ai eu une longue distraction pendant la messe, voilà tout. L'essentiel pour moi est de n'y avoir pas péché. Je ne veux plus y penser*. Et j'appuyai mes mains sur le prie-dieu sur lequel j'étais à genoux. Au moment même, et je n'étais pas encore relevé (j'étais seul dans la sacristie), j'entends prononcer bien distinctement ces paroles : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie*. Je retombe à genoux, et ma première impression fut un moment de stupéfaction. C'étaient les mêmes paroles, le même son, la même manière de les entendre. Il y a quelques instants j'essayais de ne pas croire, je voulais au moins douter ; je ne le pouvais plus, j'avais entendu, je ne pouvais me le cacher à moi-même. Un sentiment de tristesse s'empara de moi les inquiétudes qui venaient de tourmenter mon esprit se présentèrent de nouveau. J'essayai vainement de chasser toutes ces idées ; je me disais : *C'est encore une illusion, fruit de l'ébranlement donné à ton cerveau par la première impression que tu as ressentie. Tu n'as pas entendu, tu n'as pas pu entendre*. Et le sens intime me disait : *Tu ne peux douter, tu as entendu deux fois*. Je pris le parti de ne point m'occuper de ce qui venait de m'arriver, de tâcher de l'oublier. Mais ces paroles : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie* se présentaient sans cesse à mon esprit. Pour me délivrer de l'impression qui me fatiguait, je cède de guerre lasse, et je me dis : *C'est toujours un acte de dévotion à la sainte Vierge qui peut avoir un bon effet ; essayons*. Mon consentement n'était pas libre, il était exigé par la fatigue de mon esprit. Je rentrai dans mon appartement ; pour me délivrer de cette pensée, je me mis à composer les Statuts de notre Association. A peine eus-je mis la main à la plume que le sujet s'éclaircit à mes yeux, et les Statuts ne tardèrent pas à être rédigés. Voilà la vérité, et nous ne l'avons pas dite dans les premières éditions de ce *Manuel*, nous l'avons même cachée au vénérable directeur de notre conscience ; nous en avons fait jusqu'à ce jour un secret même aux amis les plus intimes ; nous n'osions pas le dévoiler, et aujourd'hui que la divine miséricorde a signalé si authentiquement son œuvre par l'établissement, la prodigieuse propagation de l'Archiconfrérie, et surtout par les fruits admirables qu'elle produit, ma conscience m'oblige à révéler ce fait. *Il est glorieux*, disait l'archange Raphaël à Tobie, *il est glorieux de recéler les œuvres de Dieu, afin que tous reconnaissent qu'à lui seul appartiennent la louange, l'honneur et la gloire*.—Vol. i. pp. lxxviii.—lxxxi.

We will make no comment. Such was the origin of that Association which has since become so famous, and acquired so

extensive a development. No sooner were the rules ready, than M. Desgenettes submitted them to the Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur de Quélen, who approved them, and formally authorized the *Archiconfrérie*. On the third Sunday in Advent, the 11th December, 1836, M. Desgenettes announced from the pulpit its actual establishment, and his 'intention to implore 'henceforth the protection of the sacred heart of Mary for the 'conversion of sinners.' From that day the offices of the Association have been celebrated every Sunday evening at seven o'clock, as well as on the festivals in honour of the Blessed Virgin and of the Association itself. The services are of a peculiar character: they commence by a hymn in French, and then comes the sermon, after which the preacher reads a list of the persons for whom the prayers of the confraternity are asked—so many men and women, young and old, so many sick, so many afflicted, so many dioceses, so many bishops, so many Protestants, so many heretics, so many Turks, so many Jews, so many infidels, so many sinners, &c. This is followed by the *Salut*, at which are said the *Tantum ergo*, the Litanies of the Blessed Virgin, the *Parce Domine*, and similar prayers. After the blessing, the *Adoremus* is sung three times, and then follow a *Pater* and an *Ave*, with the invocation, *Sancta Maria, Refugium peccatorum, Ora pro nobis*, when the congregation retires singing an additional hymn to the Virgin Mary. This service, which is very novel and attractive, is usually attended by large crowds, consisting, however, principally of women belonging to the humbler classes. They join in it with great fervour and unanimity.

The Association at first encountered a good deal of opposition, especially on the part of a considerable portion of the Paris clergy. The Archbishop himself subsequently became unfavourable to it. Two bishops, who had undertaken to bring the matter before the Pope, and obtain his sanction, afterwards, on reflection, abandoned their intention, as a *démarche indiscrete et tout à fait inutile*. The Curé's zeal, earnestness, and perseverance, however, triumphed finally over all opposition. An influential lady, residing at Rome, having accidentally heard of the Association, asked an audience from the Pope, and herself preferred M. Desgenettes' request on the subject of his Association. Pope Gregory immediately acceded to the request, and issued a brief, dated 24th April, 1838, 'creating and constituting 'à perpétuité, in the church of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in 'Paris, l'*Archiconfrérie du très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie, 'pour la conversion des pécheurs.*' Gregory, we are told, even did more than he was asked: he extended to the whole world the favour which was asked for France alone. The Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires plainly saw the finger of God in this.

Under such exalted patronage, the *Archiconfrérie* made great progress; and it has included in its roll men of all states and conditions. 'Voici la liste des membres,' says M. Desfossés, quite enthusiastically: 'comptez, ils sont inscrits par millions. Lisez, ce sont des noms de toutes conditions, deux Souverains, Pontifes, des monarques, des hommes de guerre, des hommes de loi, des savants, des riches, des pauvres, c'est l'humanité entière!' (Vol. i. p. xcvi.) The *Archiconfrérie* has now more than twenty million members, and sixteen thousand affiliated associations in different parts of the world.

M. Desgenettes' different biographers expatiate largely, and frequently in the very same words, on this his great work, as they regard it, and dilate very enthusiastically on the unprecedented benefits it has conferred, the immense moral regeneration it has accomplished, and on the number of miraculous conversions—commencing with that of M. Joly, one of the last ministers of Louis XVI., and whom M. Desgenettes specially prayed the Blessed Virgin for, and followed by that of Alphonse Ratisbonne—effected by its instrumentality, and some of which are duly chronicled in the *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*. But we will allow his principal biographer and curate again to speak:—

'Entrez dans le sanctuaire de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. C'est bien là que Marie règne et commande par sa bonté et sa miséricorde. La catholicité tout entière s'émue au récit des prodiges opérés par le nom de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, et demande à s'affilier à l'Archiconfrérie.

'Le doigt de Dieu est là. Les pécheurs se convertissent, les malades retrouvent la santé, les prodiges de tous genres s'accomplissent. La foule des fidèles de Paris va se prosterner, sans se lasser jamais, aux pieds de la statue de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. Et toujours le flot augmente. C'est vraiment l'Eglise privilégiée de Paris; elle est pleine de fidèles à toute heure du jour. Pas un étranger qui ne vienne s'agenouiller dans le sanctuaire de Marie, et y déposer des prières pour lui et tous ceux qu'il aime. Là est la vie, parce que là est la confession; là est la communion. Toutes ces merveilles, qui les a opérées? La main d'un simple prêtre.

'Si notre siècle peut à juste titre être proclamé le siècle de Marie, qui est-ce qui lui a procuré cette gloire? Nous ne craignons pas de le dire; c'est M. Desgenettes qui a propagé partout le culte de Marie. Si Pie IX, ce Pontife glorieusement régnant [P], ce saint serviteur de Marie, a proclamé le dogme de l'Immaculée Conception, qui est-ce qui a préparé les convictions et les cœurs dans toute la catholicité à demander cette proclamation? Nous ne craignons pas de le dire hautement, c'est M. Desgenettes, dont l'activité et le zèle ont répandu sur toutes les places du monde la dévotion au saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie.'—Vol. i. p. xcvi. xcix.

M. Desfossés informs us, moreover, as a proof of the good done by the *Archiconfrérie*, that as many as thirty, forty, fifty, and even seventy letters arrive weekly, announcing conversions and unexpected recoveries from illness, all of which have been

obtained by its prayers. We will not take upon ourselves to assert that M. Desgenettes' Confraternity has not done some indirect amount of good, in spite of the radically-vicious foundation upon which the whole superstructure is built; and we will not stop to investigate the origin and reality of the conversions and recoveries adverted to—of the truth of some of which we have good reasons to doubt; but whatever indirect good the *Archiconfrérie* may have done, we fear it has not been unaccompanied by a large amount of direct evil, that it has, indeed, very materially contributed—and this M. Desfossés evidently considers as M. Desgenettes' chief passport to immortality—to the promotion of the Mariolatry so frightfully and universally prevalent in France, and to the promulgation of the dogma of the 8th December, 1854. We have ourselves heard the most extraordinary doctrines—not to use a more special and expressive designation—put forth on the life, and 'privileges, and glories of Mary' from the pulpit of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, doctrines which, we know, are as strongly denounced and repudiated by many intelligent Roman Catholics, clerical and lay, as they are by Anglicans. Most heartily do we re-echo the sentiments that came into Dr. Wordsworth's mind after attending one of the services of the *Archiconfrérie* in this crowded church, and which he has recorded in one of his *Diaries*: 'Would that a voice from heaven would give a 'right impulse to the spirit of devotion which there manifested 'itself; and which (as far as zeal and alacrity are concerned) might 'supply matter for imitation to other religious communities!'¹

After the establishment of the Confraternity, the Abbé turned his attention to the restoration and embellishment of his church. It was, as we have seen, in a sad condition. The walls and altars were nearly bare, and the organs scarcely fit to use. He had the organs repaired, and the altars and images, especially those of the Blessed Virgin, profusely and luxuriantly decorated. As to the walls, 'les fidèles y pourvoyaient, en les couvrant 'd'une multitude *d'ex voto*, et cette bigarrure de marbres, où la 'reconnaissance envers la Très-Sainte Vierge éclate en mille 'aspirations diverses, réjouissait la vue du bon prêtre plus que 'les peintures ou les mosaïques les plus précieuses.' It is now a highly ornamented church.

We need scarcely say that the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires contemplated with pleasure the restoration in France of the various religious orders, and that he was on terms of great intimacy with Dom Guéranger, Lacordaire, De La

¹ *Notes at Paris*, p. 106. The reader will find in that very accurate and interesting work a good description of one of the services of the *Archiconfrérie*.

Bouillerie, and others among those who brought about their re-establishment. Dom Guéranger and Lacordaire frequently preached in his church, and so did De La Bouillerie, the founder of the *Adoration nocturne*. It was also at Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in 1850, that the Capuchins preached for the first time after their restoration.

M. Desgenettes, in conjunction with several well-known writers holding opinions similar to his own, co-operated also largely in establishing two religious periodicals, which, however, enjoyed but a short-lived existence—the *Bulletin Catholique de Bibliographie* and the *Revue Littéraire et Critique*. Of the former, only twelve numbers were published. The latter, which appeared under the auspices of the *Société de Saint-Paul*, of which Balmès, Maupied, Louis Veuillot, Amédée Gabourd, Ozanam, Charles and Henri de Riancey, were members, lived about three years. The associates of this society used to meet one evening a week, in a small room above the sacristy of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. The Abbé Desgenettes alludes to it in his *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*.

This is how the active Curé usually spent his time. He was up about five o'clock, both summer and winter. From six to nine o'clock he heard confessions in church, after which he said mass. He then returned home and partook of a frugal breakfast, and afterwards received those that wished to visit or consult him. When this was done, he went again to church to receive confessions. At twelve he dined. In the afternoon, he once more received those who wished to see him, either at home or in a small private room that he had close to the sacristy of his church; gave himself to prayer, composed his sermons, and transacted business. He supped at six, and retired to rest about eleven or twelve. On Saturdays, however, he received confessions during the greater part of the day—women in the morning, and men in the evening. He was scarcely ever absent from Paris, and when he did leave, it was only for a short time, to refresh and reinvigorate himself. On these occasions he used to go to a friend's house, at Montmorency. Every Sunday, during the long period of twenty-three years, he regularly presided over the meetings of his Confraternity.

Once only, during the space of twenty-eight years, did he absent himself from Paris for any considerable length of time; and that was on the occasion of his famous trip to Rome, in 1842, of which he has published so circumstantial and fervid an account. It need hardly be stated, that Gregory XVI. granted him immediate audience, and welcomed him with every demonstration of joy and affection. He was accompanied on his voyage by the Abbé Théodore Ratisbonne, then sub-director

of the *Archiconfrérie*, and brother to Alphonse, the famous converted Jew already mentioned. On this memorable occasion, the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires wore all his decorations—the Cross of the Golden Spur, conferred on him by Leo XII., that of Gregory the Great, conferred on him by Gregory XVI. himself, and that of the Legion of Honour, conferred by Louis Philippe.¹

The 9th July, 1853, was an eventful day for the church of Notre-Dame-des Victoires and for its Curé. We refer to the coronation and adornment with jewels and gold of the images of the Blessed Virgin and of her Son, in the presence of the nuncio, of five bishops, of sixty general officers, including the Duke of Rovigo and General Gemeau, of the mayor of Paris and two of his *adjoints*, of deputations from different religious orders, of the most distinguished ultramontanist ecclesiastics and laymen of Paris, and others. The two crowns, the gift of Pope Pius, were placed, in his name, 'sur la tête de Marie et de son divin Fils,' by Mgr. Pacca, canon of the Chapter of S. Peter's, and by M. Desgenettes himself. It is an event on which the Curé's biographers expatiate with more than habitual congeniality and enthusiasm, but we have neither space nor patience to follow them in the glowing description of the solemn puerilities enacted on that portentous occasion.

We prefer dwelling upon the Curé's warm and diffusive benevolence, and recording some few of his rare acts of noble disinterestedness and active generosity. He was ever ready to assist, both with his advice and his purse, those that came to him; and, for the sake of giving, he not only denied himself many comforts, but frequently subjected himself to many privations. He even, at one period of his life, kept no servant,

¹ The Abbé had the honour of being twice received by the Pope. On the occasion of his second visit, an amusing incident occurred. As both the Abbé Ratisbonne and the Abbé Desgenettes were about to be admitted into Gregory's presence, the former strongly impressed upon his companion, who had a most ineradicable and insatiable propensity for snuff, not to take out his snuff-box quite as often as he had done when paying the first visit. M. Desgenettes faithfully promised to keep careful watch over himself; but no sooner was he in the Pope's presence than he, as it were mechanically, put his hand into his pocket, and took out his unfortunate snuff-box. Suddenly, however, recollecting his promise, he tried to slip it in again without anybody perceiving it. But the Pope had noticed the Abbé's little *manège*; and knowing perfectly and experimentally what a snuff-taker suffers without his snuff, he took out his own box, opened it, and presented it to the Curé, who of course took a large pinch. Some of the Abbé's biographers seem quite amazed at this act of condescension on the part of the Pope, and at the unprecedented honour conferred upon the Curé de Notre-Dames-de-Victoires, to which all other distinctions—the crosses of the Eperon-d'Or, St. Gregory, and Legion of Honour—are not for an instant to be compared. These crosses are common enough, but as M. de Valette sagaciously and profoundly observes, 'Priser dans la tabatière du Pape, cela n'est pas donné à tout le monde!'

in order to be able to bestow more money in charities. When Curé of the Missions Etrangères, he gave 3,000 francs to a *garde-du-corps* for the payment of a debt which was going to cost him his place. On another occasion, he presented 15,000 francs to a merchant, who, but for this bounty, would have been completely ruined, as well as took charge of the education of his two children. In 1834 and 1835, he succeeded in collecting 47,920 francs for the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was then in Paris in great poverty and heavily in debt; and many times he paid the debts of some of his parishioners who had been arrested and confined in the prison of Clichy. He was particularly kind to the poor of his parish; indeed, we believe M. Desfossés' statement on the subject of his charity to be literally true: 'Sa charité pour secourir les pauvres était grande comme son cœur. Impossible de citer une misère qu'il n'ait secourue aussitôt qu'il l'a connue.'

In all the relations of social life, he seems to have been an indulgent friend, and one in whom the most unlimited and implicit reliance could be placed. He was particularly remarkable for his straightforwardness and high moral rectitude. His demeanour was very inartificial and unassuming, and his conversation lively, animated, and entertaining. In the few hours of careless relaxation he enjoyed in the company of intimate friends he was full of liveliness and fun, and, as our readers have had an opportunity of judging for themselves, used to tell capital stories. In allusion to his fame, which was so widely spread, he once exclaimed, in one of his sportive moods, 'Mon nom! mon nom! c'est une savate qui court le monde!' His temper was cheerful and sympathising, though sometimes acidulated with a considerable quantity of petulance and *brusquerie*.

Neither in youth nor in middle age was the Abbé, as we have seen, particularly remarkable for suavity of manner or equanimity of temper, or even for that external politeness—frequently only external—which is supposed to be one of the predominant characteristics of Frenchmen. Even when far advanced in life, his *vivacité* and petulance would break forth now and then, and this, in spite of all he had done to correct himself of these defects—in spite, to use M. de Mont-Rond's expression, of his 'transformation complète devant l'autel de Marie'—in spite, as another biographer, M. Aubineau, would say, of his being 'enivré des grâces obtenues par le saint Cœur de Marie!' We will give one or two examples of his want of courtesy and even *rudesse*. A lady, the wife of an officer who is about to start for Madagascar, pays him a visit, attracted by his reputed sanctity. She is young and timid, and accosting him with great trepidation, says:—

"Monsieur le curé."

"Qu'est-ce que vous me voulez ?"

"Je voudrais vous parler."

"Vous confessez-vous d'habitude ?"

"Oui, monsieur le curé."

"Eh bien, allez trouver votre confesseur ; vous n'avez pas besoin de moi."

"Mais, monsieur. . ."

"Mais, madame, je n'ai pas de temps à perdre pour vous."

"Mais ce n'est pas pour moi, c'est pour mon mari, un officier. . ."

"Eh ! que ne le disiez-vous pas de suite ! C'est tout autre chose."

He then asks her to sit down, listens to her, and grants the rendezvous she solicited for her husband.

Another lady arrives from the country, bearing a message from a person whom the Abbé had converted. She is so badly received by the Curé that she at once retires. The next day, she follows him after mass to the sacristy. There a young man was already waiting for him. As soon as the Curé sees him, he runs up to him, embraces him, and addresses him with the most affectionate kindness. On the young man's departure, she goes up to the Curé, and tells him :—

"Vous êtes donc bon quelquefois ?"

"Que voulez-vous dire, madame ?"

"Je viens de vous voir si bon avec ce monsieur, et vous m'avez hier si mal reçue."

"Moi, allons, ma brusquerie m'a encore joué un de ses tours ! Eh bien, je vous écoute, seulement ne soyez pas trop longue."

When he knew what she wished to speak to him about, he listened to her with great attention, and gave her the necessary explanations.

No one was more sensible than the Abbé himself of his infirmities of temper. One day Mme. Tisserand, mother of the well-known missionary of that name, the Apostolical Prefect of Guinea, who perished so nobly in the wreck of the *Papin*, said to the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, 'Quel dommage que vous soyez si brusque et si maussade ! On ne sait à quelle heure venir pour vous trouver bon !' 'Vous avez bien raison,' replied he ; 'je ne suis que mauvais et bourru ; obtenez-moi la grâce de changer.'

On another occasion he addressed the following singular speech to a duchess who was praising his benevolence and charity : 'Madame, on m'appelle rude abord. Je ne suis qu'un pauvre pécheur, et vous, madame, qu'êtes-vous ?' He then turned his back upon her, and went away.

These infirmities of temper grieved and humbled the Curé sadly, and he made the best amends he could for them. We are told by M. Desfossés that he 'expiated them twice annually.'

On the Sunday after his festival, and on the anniversary of his ordination, he ascended the pulpit, and, with the deepest humility, asked pardon for his impatience and petulance, smiting his breast, and styling himself a 'pauvre pécheur.' 'Les larmes qu'il répandait témoignaient de la grandeur de son repentir. Alors l'émotion gagnait l'assistance tout entière, et les larmes de tous prouvaient combien on était touché de tant d'humilité, de tant de grandeur, de tant de sainteté.'—Vol. i. p. cxx.

But infirmities of another nature were now growing fast upon him. His strength was gradually decreasing, and his voice failing him. He celebrated mass for the last time on the 4th November, 1858, the day of the festival of his patron saint, Charles Borromeo. For some time he was regularly carried to the Chapel of the Virgin Mary; eventually, however, he was confined to his house, and had mass celebrated and received confessions in his room. During the winter of 1859–1860 his health gradually and perceptibly declined. Though suffering from a painful malady, or rather from a complication of maladies, he was patient and resigned; his feelings seemed absorbed in feelings for others; and, when reduced to the last stage of weakness, he still continued conversing with spirit and energy on the subjects dearest to his heart—his Confraternity and his flock—and to read all the correspondence connected with the former. As he grew worse, and his end seemed approaching, he evinced great composure; and, when his recovery was hopeless, he even indulged in a little *badinage*—somewhat inopportune perhaps—with his friend Dr. Teissier, who attended him: 'Si vous me guérissez, je vous donne un merle blanc!' In spite of the Doctor's representations and remonstrances, he refused to eat *gras* during the Holy Week of 1860. From that period it became evident that the worst expectations of his friends were soon to be realized. Great was the sensation when the religious journals of the capital announced his dangerous illness, and innumerable were the calls made to know how he was. The Archbishop of Paris visited him several times, and had long conversations with him; so did the Duke and Duchess of Padoue, the Count Germiny, Governor of the Bank of France, Count Châteaubriant, the Abbé Bautain, M. Veuillot, M. Benoît d'Azy, M. Amédée Thayer, M. de Montalembert, and several other *notabilités*; and many were the books, images, chaplets, and medals that were brought to him for his blessing. 'Fervent prayers' also, says M. Desfossés, were addressed for him—not to the God and Saviour of all—but to 'the throne of Mary.' Some of the details recorded of his last moments are very characteristic. During

one of M. Desfossés' visits, the following conversation occurred between himself and the dying man:—

"Monsieur le curé, vous offrez vos souffrances à Dieu, n'est-ce pas?"

"Sans doute, mon fils, qu'en ferais je?"

"Notre-Seigneur a bien souffert, lui aussi, plus que vous!"

"Oh! ce n'est pas comparable."

"Vous aimez bien la Sainte Vierge?"

"A ces mots, comme toujours, lorsque je lui parlais de Marie, un doux et rayonnant sourire effleurait ses lèvres et épanouissait sa figure. Il répondit:

"A juste titre, je l'aime!"

"Vous avez bien travaillé pour sa gloire?"

"Non, mon fils, je n'ai rien fait," répondit le saint curé, en remuant négativement la tête.

"Mais votre grande œuvre, l'Archiconfrérie est là."

"Ah! je n'ai pas fait tout ce que j'aurais dû faire."—Vol. i. p. cxxix.

To a young man for whom he had obtained a place at the Bank, and who was assisting to remove him from one bed to another, the Curé said, 'Voilà le dernier service que vous me rendez. Allons, embrassez-moi.' The young man leaned forward, and just touched one cheek with his lips. 'Eh bien! eh bien! est-ce ainsi qu'on embrasse quand on aime? embrassez-moi sur les deux joues!'

He recommended a person present to pray for him, but added he: 'Que ce ne soit pas humainement. Demandez à Dieu qu'il me fasse beaucoup souffrir afin de me purifier avant ma mort.' 'Vous voulez donc,' replied his friend, 'entrer tout droit au ciel, M. le curé? mais cela vous arrivera certainement.' 'Ah! mon ami,' retorted the Abbé, 'non, cela ne m'arrivera pas. Je n'en suis pas digne, je ne pourrai pas éviter le purgatoire.'

M. Thayer's chaplain having asked him his blessing upon a new branch-association of his *Archiconfrérie*, he answered, 'Priez, persévérez, et vous triompherez. La dévotion au saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie est le principe et le centre de toute dévotion.'

On the 20th April he received extreme unction from his confessor, Father Soimier, and the viaticum from the Vicar-General and Archdeacon of Paris, the Abbé Baquet, and breathed his last at two o'clock in the morning of the 24th, in the eighty-second year of his age. He had been visited for the last time on the preceding evening by the Archbishop of Paris, who had found him still perfectly sensible, though unable to speak. During the three days that the *exposition du corps* lasted, tens of thousands of people went to the *chapelle ardente* to pay their respects to his memory. On the Sunday especially such numbers flocked to the building that persons had to wait a considerable time before being able to enter. The funeral took

place on the 30th April, in the presence of an immense crowd of persons, including the nuncio, the Bishop of Autun, most of the Paris curés, Montalembert, Veuillot, the Count of Brissac, Senator Thayer, and the Governor of the Bank of France. Mass was celebrated by the Vicar-General of the diocese, and the absolution given by the Archbishop, who delivered at the same time a funeral oration over his grave. By reason of the Abbé's great fame the corpse was, in conformity with the request of his parishioners, and with the Emperor's special permission, which was duly registered in the *Moniteur*, entombed in the church of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in a vault expressly prepared for it in front of the altar of the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin.

We now come to M. Desgenettes' literary productions. The *Œuvres inédites* before us consist of some hundred and forty-six discourses, reprinted from the author's own manuscripts, which, two years before his death, he entrusted, we presume, with a view to publication, to M. Desfossés, and of a few detached essays on various religious and theological subjects. Few of these discourses are, properly speaking, sermons; they form rather respectively, what are technically called *Instructions*, *Prônes*, *Conférences*, and so forth; and they range over the various topics usually treated of, too often with a good deal of monotonous sameness, in French pulpits, and suggested by the different Sundays and other festivals of the Christian year. They comprise, also, a series of lectures on the Decalogue, and a few panegyrics. Whatever may be the theological deficiencies or excrescences of some of M. Desgenettes' sermons, they are all most unexceptionable and orthodox in their divisions. Like all French compositions of that nature, properly so called, their different heads and divisions are carefully announced in the exordium, and elaborately and minutely traced out in the two *points* of which they consist. M. Desgenettes' discourses are plain, clear, unaffected, practical, affectionate, and well-adapted to the mixed nature of the congregations before which they were delivered.

'Tous le degrés de l'échelle sociale,' we are told, 'étaient représentés à l'auditoire de l'église de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. Cet auditoire n'était pas composé exclusivement, comme on le voit pour certains prédicateurs, de telle ou telle classe de la société; mais c'était l'auditoire de toutes les classes indistinctement, comme était celui de Jésus-Christ et des Apôtres. Comme son divin Modèle, il entraînait les populations à sa suite. On voyait confondus, dans les vastes nefs de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, l'homme d'épée et le magistrat, le riche négociant et le laborieux artisan, la dame richement mise et la pauvre ouvrière, le savant et l'ignorant, le prêtre et le fidèle. Chacun recevait avec avidité la parole du bon et éloquent pasteur, et tous s'en retournaient devenus meilleurs.'

As to what is here said about the *Curé entraînant les populations à sa suite*, and *tous s'en retournant devenus meilleurs*, there is something of the French love of exaggeration and hyperbole in the assertion ; but there is no doubt his discourses were well adapted to an auditory composed of so many different elements. If we fail to discover in them the depth of thought, the originality and comprehensiveness of view, the lofty flights of fancy, the variety of illustration, the power of argument, the forcible appeals to the feelings, the scrupulous elegance of diction, the brilliant thoughts expressed in brilliant language, the polish and the finish, and the impassioned bursts of eloquence, which characterize more or less the discourses of some of M. Desgenettes' contemporaries, living and dead, such as Frayssinous, Maccarthy, Ravignan, Lacordaire, Fayet, Combalot, Bautain, La Place, Felix, and others—they are at least free from the hardness and the dryness, the solemn and empty pretentiousness, the turgidity, the unreal conventionalisms, the clap-trap, the ostentatious and paltry artifices of composition, the abstract speculations, and the too frequently unintelligible transcendentalisms observable in some of the discourses of his countrymen. Some writers have spoken somewhat disparagingly of M. Desgenettes' discourses, whilst the ultramontanists generally have indulged in the most indiscriminating and unwarranted eulogiums on them, and regarded them as perfection. Both, it seems to us, are wrong. They are simply the discourses of an earnest, sensible, practical, reflecting, and experienced mind, well acquainted with human nature, and with the special wants of his people. His great object seems to have been to teach, reprove, rebuke, comfort, and exhort, and not to shine or dazzle. The preacher evidently spoke from the heart, as he evidently also, primarily and chiefly, appealed to the heart and consciences of his hearers. 'Si l'esprit a sa part, le cœur a la sienne plus grande encore et la conscience aussi,' is perfectly applicable to his discourses, which are marked by the earnestness and reality, the true sympathy with the trials and wants of others, the artless feeling and affectionate persuasiveness which thoroughly penetrated his nature, and the complete forgetfulness of self in the enunciation of the Divine Message, for which he was so pre-eminently distinguished ; and if his were not exactly the

'Thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,'

they were at least the

'Thoughts that rove about,
And loudly knock to have their passage out.'

Indeed, what the editors of Mr. Jay record of his preaching is not an inapt picture, *mutatis mutandis*, of M. Desgenettes him-

self: 'He spoke from his own nature to the nature of others. He was himself a most inartificial man. He knew human nature well. He studied it in himself and in others. He knew man, how he thinks, and feels, and acts. He drew his knowledge, not from copies and books, but from the living original. Men felt, when they heard him, that they were listening to a preacher who knew not only books, and theories, and systems, but humanity, both in its fallen and restored state: in its wants, woes, diseases, remedies, and varieties; one who could sympathise with them as well as teach them.'¹ These characteristics will probably account, to a great extent, for his popularity and efficiency as a preacher. Well has it been said: 'It is not the most intellectual ministry which is chiefly honoured of God, recommended, though it be, by all that is faithful in statement, and all that is attractive in style. It is the message of the man of prayer; of one who has been wrestling with God for a blessing beforehand; of one who looks upon the pulpit as such an "awful place," that, while there, he can forget self, forget reputation, forget everything, but the one solemn fact, that his words have immortality—made by no choice of power of his own—a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death.'²

Another noticeable feature in M. Desgenettes' sermons is his clearness of language and perspicuity of arrangement. We are told that the respected author took a great deal of pains in the composition of his sermons, and that he meditated long and anxiously what he wrote; and this we can believe. 'Pour bien écrire,' says Buffon, 'il faut posséder pleinement son sujet; il faut y réfléchir assez pour voir clairement l'ordre de ses pensées, et en former une suite, une chaîne continue, dont chaque point représente une idée; et lorsqu'on aura pris la plume, il faudra la conduire successivement sur ce premier trait, sans lui permettre de s'en écarter, sans l'appuyer trop inégalement, sans lui donner d'autre mouvement que celui qui sera déterminé par l'espace qu'elle doit parcourir.'³ Boileau also has remarked:—

'Avant d'écrire, apprenez à penser.

Selon que notre idée est plus ou moins obscure,
L'expression la suit, ou moins nette, ou plus pure.
Ce que l'on conçoit bien s'énonce clairement,
Et les mots pour le dire arrivent aisément.'⁴

M. Desgenettes seems to have followed these rules. His sermons are remarkable for the clear arrangement of the several parts, and the perspicuous distribution of the materials of which they are composed. He reflected well upon what he was going to say, and expressed his thoughts—and occasionally also, we

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 549.

³ *Discours sur le Style*.

² *Moore's Thoughts on Preaching*, p. 89.

⁴ *L'Art Poétique*, Chant III.

must add, the thoughts of others, as we shall see presently—in a plain, concise, and forcible way, without any sort of tinsel, pedantry, diffusiveness, vague generalities, or rhetorical embellishments. As has been said of Latimer, ‘a fresh and rough ‘fragrance of nature hangs about him everywhere, impregnating ‘and purifying with a rare and happy heartiness all his work.’¹ He never wanders out of his subject, and there is a great deal of reality in all he says: he always seems to speak because he has something to say; and if originality, richness, elegance, and comprehensiveness are not among the distinguishing features of his discourses, this is compensated by the definiteness, the earnestness, and well-sustained fervour which

‘Breathe throughout, and animate the whole.’

M. Desgenettes’ delivery was in character with the nature of his sermons, and his own. It was natural, unostentatious, impressive, destitute of every species of affectation and artificiality. He addressed his hearers, as a father would his children, with a dignified calmness, we might say a *bonhomie*, which, in another preacher, might have soon repelled a French audience, but which, in this ‘venerable ecclesiastic with long white hair,’ as Dr. Wordsworth describes him, were very appropriate and pleasing, and produced a good effect. In his later years he frequently sat down while delivering his sermon. He also stopped frequently, as has been already remarked, in the course of his discourse to take large pinches of snuff. He possessed in a high degree what M. Bautain calls a *voix sympathique*, which he defines as ‘a power of attraction which draws to it the ‘hearer’s mind, and on its accents hangs its attention’—‘as a ‘voice which inspires affection for him who speaks, and puts ‘you instinctively on his side, so that its words find in your ‘mind an echo which repeats there what is said, and reproduces ‘it easily in the understanding and heart.’² We would not place the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires exactly on a par with the great Christian hero supposed to be represented in the life-like ‘Character of a Good Parson;’ nevertheless, on seeing the silver-haired and venerable old man, we have been more than once reminded of the celebrated portraiture:—

‘Refined himself to soul, to curb the sense,
And made almost a sin of abstinence.
Yet had his aspect nothing of severe,
But such a face as promised him sincere.
Nothing reserved or sullen was to see,
But sweet regards and pleasing sanctity:
Mild was his accent and his action free.’

¹ Tullock’s *Leaders of the Reformation*, p. 305.

² *Etude sur l’Art de parler en public*, p. 89.

Au reste, if large congregations and sustained attention on their part are criterions of a preacher's attractiveness and usefulness, M. Desgenettes had every reason to be satisfied. De Villiers has said :—

‘ Crois qu’un sermon est bon quand il est écouté.
Prêcher n’est pas savoir bien parler, bien écrire,
Mais se faire écouter en tout ce que l’on veut dire.
Par là se faire suivre, et qui n’a pas ce don,
Peut bien faire un discours, mais non pas un sermon ; ’—¹

And this was the case with M. Desgenettes. We are told that people came from all parts of Paris to hear him, and that ‘ aussitôt qu’il paraissait en chaire, le silence du désert se faisait. ‘ A l’attention pleine de sympathie et de contentement qui ‘ rayonnait sur tous les visages, on pouvait juger aussitôt de ‘ l’entraînement des cœurs.’

We will give one or two extracts from M. Desgenettes’ works. The following argument on a subject which is now attracting a good deal of attention among ourselves is well put :—

‘ D’impies et d’absurdes raisonneurs ont osé avancer que des miracles étaient impossibles, parce qu’ils étaient contraires aux lois éternelles, générales, établies pour le gouvernement et la conservation de l’univers, que Dieu, essentiellement ami de l’ordre, ne pouvait violer les règles éternelles de la nature. Quand les impies raisonnent ainsi, ils ne s’entendent plus eux-mêmes. La puissance de Dieu peut-elle avoir des bornes ? N’est-elle pas infinie ? Quelle est donc cette éternité dont on gratifie les lois qui régissent la nature ? N’ont-elles pas commencé et ne doivent-elles pas finir avec l’univers ? D’où viennent ces lois ? Qui les a faites ? Qui leur a donné une marche uniforme ? N’est-ce pas Dieu ? Et le Divin-Architecte a-t-il voulu, a-t-il pu même enchaîner sa puissance, en soumettant sa volonté au joug d’une aveugle nécessité ? Non, Dieu, et Dieu seul, dispose en Maître souverain de la nature ; l’ordre physique est son ouvrage, et quand il y veut déroger, il est tout à fait dans l’ordre que cette dérogation se fasse, et dans ce cas les lois de la nature ne périssent point, mais sont seulement suspendues par quelques exceptions passagères.’—
Vol. i. pp. 249, 250.

The three sermons on our Lord’s Passion, comprised in the works before us, contain some good and effective passages, and are among the most remarkable in the volumes. We had marked for extraction a passage from one of them, which, if not particularly distinguished for gracefulness, contains one or two striking thoughts forcibly expressed, and is not an inappropriate specimen of the Curé’s ‘ unadorned eloquence,’ but we have no space for it. We will, however, give an extract from one of the short disquisitions comprised in the fourth volume, and entitled *Raison et Mystères*. M. Desgenettes thus adjusts the respective positions, offices, and claims of reason and faith. He holds the

¹ *Art de prêcher. Chant III.*

balance far more evenly and justly than is usually done by ultramontanist writers :—

‘Si la raison doit se taire sur ce qui concerne le fond des mystères, dit l’incrédule, il faut donc croire sans raison : or, une croyance destituée de raison est la croyance d’un imbécile. Raisonnement pitoyable ! Oui, la raison doit se taire sur le fond de nos mystères, et s’humilier devant leur profondeur ; mais il ne s’ensuit pas qu’on doive les croire sans raison. Distinguons les raisons de *crédulité* [*? crédibilité*] d’avec les raisons de *compréhensibilité* : elles ne sont point inséparables, puis qu’elles sont séparées de fait dans une infinité de circonstances. Et sans sortir du monde physique, combien d’effets dans la nature qui ont des raisons de *crédibilité*, parce qu’ils sont attestés par le témoignage constant et uniforme des sens, et qui cependant n’ont aucune raison de *compréhensibilité*, parce qu’ils ne peuvent être expliqués d’une manière satisfaisante pour l’esprit ? Or, il en est de même de nos mystères : quoique nous ne puissions les comprendre, nous avons cependant, à leur égard, les raisons de *crédibilité* les plus fortes et les plus victorieuses. Notre croyance n’est donc pas celle d’un imbécile, mais une croyance fondée en raison de croire.

‘Dieu, en imposant aux hommes le joug de la foi, n’a pas voulu anéantir la raison. Il a lié les vérités incompréhensibles aux hommes à des vérités dont ils peuvent s’instruire par les voies les plus connues. Ces vérités sont manifestées par des faits sur lesquels il n’y a point de dispute. Tels sont les miracles de Moïse, de Jésus-Christ, des Apôtres, des Martyrs et de toute l’Eglise, auxquels la religion chrétienne est attachée comme à ses preuves. Ou ne saurait contester ces faits sans combattre le sens commun, puisque les païens même, ne pouvant en nier l’évidence, se sont bornés pendant trois siècles à les attribuer à la magie. La vérité de la religion chrétienne, démontrée par les prodiges, emporte avec elle la vérité des mystères, quelque incompréhensibles qu’ils soient ; une vraie religion ne saurait enseigner l’erreur. “Jésus-Christ,” dit Saint Augustin, “a demandé la foi aux hommes, mais avant de la demander, il l’a méritée par les miracles.”¹

‘N’admettre que la raison en matière de religion, c’est détruire la foi, dont le propre est de nous faire croire ce que nous ne comprenons pas. Ne rien accorder à la raison, c’est une autre extrémité. La vérité est au milieu. L’homme, en devenant chrétien, ne cesse pas d’être raisonnable. Comme il doit avoir des raisons de parler et d’agir, il doit avoir aussi des raisons de croire ; *rationabile obsequium*. Cette maxime regarde l’esprit, comme la volonté. La foi n’exclut donc point la raison, mais la suppose.

‘La foi, dit-on, est obscure : cela est vrai, mais cette obscurité ne regarde que son objet, et non pas le motif qui nous porte à y acquiescer. Je ne puis concevoir l’existence d’un Dieu en trois Personnes : ce dogme est obscur pour moi ; mais la raison me dit que je ne puis me refuser à la révélation qui l’enseigne, parce qu’elle conçoit que Dieu ne peut pas nous induire en erreur.

‘La foi, pourrait-on ajouter, est le sacrifice de la raison : oui, sans doute, puisqu’elle l’humilie, en l’obligeant de croire ce qu’elle ne peut comprendre ; mais c’est la raison elle-même qui exige de nous ce sacrifice, en nous en faisant sentir la nécessité.

‘La raison conduit l’homme à la foi, en lui découvrant la force des preuves de la religion : car la vraie religion connue le mène directement à la connaissance de ses mystères. Telle est donc la marche de l’esprit aidé et éclairé par le flambeau de la raison. La vraie religion, pense-t-il, ne peut induire en erreur ; une source pure ne produit point de ruisseaux impurs. Or, la religion chrétienne est la seule véritable ; ma raison ne peut résister à ses preuves, qui sont l’accomplissement des prophéties, les miracles de Jésus-Christ, sa résurrection, les progrès merveilleux de l’Evangile, la constance des

¹ ‘Quid est fides, nisi credere quod non vides ?’—S. August. *Tract. iv. in Joann.*

martyrs, la fécondité de l'Eglise au milieu des supplices, et autres : la religion chrétienne ne peut donc m'engager dans l'erreur. Or, elle me propose tels et tels dogmes ; c'est donc pour moi un devoir de les croire, quoique je ne puisse pas les comprendre. Ce raisonnement n'est point celui d'un superstitieux.

'Le chrétien, dans la religion, procède, suivant les règles de la dialectique la plus exacte, d'une vérité connue à d'autres qu'il ne connaissait pas, de la certitude des miracles à la vérité de la religion chrétienne, de celle-ci à la vérité des mystères qu'il ne comprend point. L'impie suit une méthode opposée : semblable à ces oiseaux nocturnes qui n'aiment que les ténèbres ; il part des points les plus obscurs pour attaquer les plus clairs, prétendant combattre, par ses mystères, une religion fondée sur des preuves aussi évidentes : il prouve, au contraire, qu'il est aussi mauvais philosophe que mauvais chrétien.'—Vol. iv. p. 443—445.

In a short account of the Abbé Desgenettes' works and style of preaching, appended to the volumes before us, the publisher thinks it necessary specially to recommend them to the attention of French preachers, not only as models of pulpit eloquence, but also as well adapted to prove serviceable for another, and perhaps less unexceptionable, purpose. 'MM. les Ecclésiastiques,' says M. Levesque, with remarkable disinterestedness and naïveté, 'soit de la ville, soit de la campagne, ainsi que les Séminaires, trouveront dans ces œuvres un ample moisson d'instructions, de prônes et de sermons.' We have not the slightest doubt that Messieurs les Ecclésiastiques will find them a most convenient repertory, rich in all sorts of valuable material, for the object indicated by the very enterprising director of the *Librairie du sacré Cœur de Marie*, but it was hardly necessary to make a formal announcement to that effect. '*Vraiment, Monsieur, ce n'était pas la peine de le dire!*' French preachers, we know—acting, we presume, on Molière's convenient maxim, '*C'est mon bien, et je le prends partout où je le trouve,*' do not hesitate to extract largely from the labours of others—ay, and even occasionally to give them to the public as their own. Judging from the extent to which this habit prevails among French preachers¹ (and we might add French devotional and religious writers generally), we suppose the proceeding perfectly allowable; but we must confess that this appropriation of other men's thoughts and language is sometimes carried rather far; and in reading some of their sermons one not unfrequently stumbles upon a genuine piece from Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Lejeune, Cheminai, Fléchier, Mascaron, Texier, De la Rue, Neuville, Cambacérès, and other writers more or less known, to say nothing of the Fathers. Not only are the whole plan and scope of certain published sermons by different writers, treating of

¹ This is also a very common proceeding among Spanish and Italian preachers. Dr. Wolff tells us, for instance, that the famous description of Hell and Paradise given by Segneri is the very same as that which he once read in a Rabbinical book, and in a Surah of the Koran.—*Travels and Adventures*, last ed. p. 54.

the same subject, absolutely identical ; not only are the line of thought and general mode of treatment, the exordium, divisions, and peroration, very much the same ; but it sometimes happens also that there exists a very remarkable similarity in what may be called the minor accessories of the discourse and the working out of the details, the only apparent variety consisting in a few 'local tinges given to general thoughts' extracted from the writings of others, with the necessary amount of *remplissage*, and 'a dash of colour' thrown in here and there to disguise the plagiarism, or to adapt the sermon to the peculiar circumstances of its hearers ;—nay, we have sometimes met with whole passages, carefully selected from the works of the preachers of former times, and incorporated, without the slightest acknowledgment or remorse, into professed original compositions ! If such discourses cannot be regarded as perfect models of conception and invention, and if it cannot be predicated of them, to use an expression of the French Academy, that they 'confer the highest honour on human intellect,' to their authors must at least be conceded the merit of a practical and discriminating acquaintance with their predecessors' labours.

This characteristic of many modern French sermons is observable in many parts of the four volumes before us. We do not profess to have minutely and thoroughly examined the whole of M. Desgenettes' discourses ; nevertheless, cursory as our perusal has been, we have read enough to see that he is often greatly indebted to some of the preachers that have preceded him. We do not know what the extent of his reading may have been in other directions : the administration of his immense parish, and the many works of charity he organized and directed, and which absorbed so considerable a portion of his time, doubtless prevented his devoting much time to theological study ; but his sermons seem at any rate to afford unequivocal evidence that he was well versed in the writings of the great preachers of a former period among his countrymen. We have not only noticed many a passage which is a mere elaboration and development of some idea from Bourdaloue and Massillon, but in some instances the respected author has not scrupled to appropriate their very language, and to interweave, with what we take to be his own compositions, lengthy and well-known paragraphs from their writings. We repeat it, from the frequency and coolness with which this is done, we must suppose that French publishers of sermons generally, and the late Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires in particular, have habitually regarded such a proceeding as perfectly legitimate ; and the more so in the latter case, as in the good Abbé's five lectures on the seventh of the Commandments, as rearranged by the Roman Church, there is no reference

whatever to literary pilfering; but we must say we never expected to find the process carried to such an extent in anybody's *œuvres inédites*! For instance, the whole of the five, and somewhat closely printed, pages comprising the *second point* of the Abbé's second sermon *Sur le Salut*, with the exception of a few slight omissions and additions, are a simple and literal reproduction of a short dissertation to be found among Bourdaloue's *Opuscules*, and entitled, *Petit nombre des élus; de quelle manière il faut l'entendre; et le fruit qu'on peut retirer de cette considération*. The Abbé might as well have transcribed, preached, and published as his own the well-known conclusion of S. Vincent de Paul's sermon, *pour l'Œuvre des Enfants trouvés*, Bossuet's celebrated passage on Cromwell, in his *Oraison funèbre de Henriette-Marie de France*, or that on the eloquence of S. Paul in his panegyric on that Apostle, Massillon's sermon on the *Petit nombre des élus*, or Bourdaloue's own *Puissance de Jésus-Christ dans sa Passion*, forming the first division of his Sermon for Good Friday, as transcribe, preach, and leave for publication, as his own, the passage before us. We will place side by side an extract from Bourdaloue and one from Desgenettes. They will serve as an excellent specimen of what sometimes passes in France as *œuvres inédites*, and illustrate at the same time the remarkable progress made in the art of grammar generally, and punctuation in particular, as well as in the science of theology, since the time of Bourdaloue.

BOURDALOUE.

'Quoiqu'il en soit, tout auditeur sage et chrétien profitera de cette pensée du petit nombre des élus, et, saisi d'une juste frayeur, il apprendra : 1^o, à redoubler sa vigilance, et à se prémunir plus que jamais contre tous les dangers où peut l'exposer le commerce de la vie ; 2^o, à ne pas demeurer un seul jour dans l'état de péché mortel, s'il lui arrive quelquefois d'y tomber, mais à courir incessamment au remède et à se relever par un prompt retour ; 3^o, à se séparer de la multitude, et par conséquent du monde, à s'en séparer, dis-je, sinon d'effet, car tous ne le peuvent pas, au moins d'esprit, de cœur, de maximes, de sentiments, de pratiques ; 4^o, à suivre le petit nombre des chrétiens vraiment chrétiens, c'est-à-dire des chrétiens réglés dans toute leur conduite, fidèles à tous leurs devoirs, assidus au service de Dieu, charitables envers le prochain,

DESGENETTES.

'Nous devons tous profiter de cette pensée du petit nombre des élus, et, saisis d'une juste frayeur, nous apprendrons premièrement à redoubler notre vigilance et à nous prémunir plus que jamais contre tous les dangers où peut nous exposer le commerce de la vie. En second lieu, à ne pas demeurer un seul jour dans l'état du [sic] péché mortel, s'il arrive par malheur d'y tomber ; mais à courir incessamment au remède, pour être relevés par un prompt retour. En troisième lieu, à nous séparer de la multitude, et par conséquent du monde, à nous en séparer sinon d'effet (car tous ne le peuvent pas), et au moins [sic] d'esprit, de cœur, de maximes, de sentiments, de conduite. En quatrième lieu, à suivre le petit nombre des chrétiens, vraiment chrétiens ; c'est-à-dire des chrétiens réglés dans toute leur vie, fidèles à tous leurs devoirs, assidus au

BOURDALOUE.

soigneux de se perfectionner et de s'avancer par un continuel exercice des vertus, dégagés de tout intérêt humain, de toute ambition, de toute attachement profane, de tout ressentiment, de toute fraude, de toute injustice, de tout ce qui peut blesser la conscience et la corrompre ; 5°, à prendre résolument et généreusement la voie étroite, puisque c'est l'unique voie que Jésus-Christ est venu nous enseigner ; à s'efforcer, selon la parole du même Sauveur, et à se roidir contre tous les obstacles, soit du dedans, soit du dehors, contre le penchant de la nature, contre l'empire des sens, contre le torrent de la coutume, contre l'attrait des compagnies, contre les impressions de l'exemple, contre les discours et le jugements du public, n'ayant en vue que de se sauver, ne voulant que cela, ne cherchant que cela, n'étant en peine que de cela ; 6°, enfin, à réclamer sans cesse la grâce du ciel, à recommander sans cesse son âme à Dieu, et à lui faire chaque jour l'excellente prière de Salomon : *Dieu de miséricorde, Seigneur, donnez-moi la vraie sagesse qui est la science du salut, et ne me rejetez jamais du nombre de vos enfants* (Sap. ix), qui sont vos élus, &c., &c.'—*Œuvres complètes*, vol. iii. p. 333. Paris : 1840, ed. Didot.

DESGENETTES.

service de Dieu, charitables envers le prochain, soigneux de se perfectionner et de s'avancer par un continuel exercice des vertus de leur état ; dégagés de tout intérêt humain, de toute ambition, de tout attachement profane, de tout ressentiment, de toute fraude, de toute dissimulation, de toute injustice, en un mot, de tout ce qui peut blesser la conscience et la corrompre. Enfin, à prendre résolument et généreusement la voie étroite, puisque c'est l'unique voie que Jésus-Christ est venu nous enseigner, à s'efforcer et à se roidir contre tous les obstacles, soit du dedans, soit du dehors, contre le penchant de la nature corrompue, contre l'empire des sens, contre le torrent de la coutume, contre l'attrait des compagnies dangereuses et du respect humain, contre les impressions du mauvais exemple, contre les discours et les jugements du public ; n'ayant en vue que de nous sauver, ne voulant que cela, ne cherchant que cela, n'étant en peine que de cela.

* Ajoutons encore, à réclamer sans cesse la grâce du ciel, à recommander sans cesse notre âme à Dieu, à la sainte Vierge, à nos Anges tutélaires, à nos saints Patrons et à tous les Saints, dont chaque année on célèbre la mémoire ; à faire à Dieu chaque jour cette excellente prière de Salomon : O Dieu de miséricorde, Seigneur, donnez-moi la vraie sagesse, qui est la science du salut, et ne me rejetez jamais du nombre de vos enfants, qui sont vos élus, &c., &c.'—*Œuvres inédites*, vol. iii. pp. 173, 174.

Should another edition of these volumes be called for, which will doubtless be the case—especially if the publisher's hint be taken by 'Messieurs les ecclésiastiques'—we trust M. Desfossés will incorporate into the work some of the Abbé Desgenettes' correspondence, which was very varied and extensive, and which would prove interesting to a large class of readers. We trust, also, he will subject the whole work to a careful and thorough revision. The volumes before us abound in errors—we know not whether to regard them as misprints or blunders—which sadly disfigure them. We have stumbled upon many instances of bad grammar, both in the *Notice Biographique* and in the works ; the punctuation particularly, which we have taken the

liberty to rectify in some of the extracts we have given, is wretched throughout. In several places also words seem to have been omitted. Neither do we like the expression 'prêtre jureur,' which the biographer uses occasionally—it is not only very *familière*, but also equivocal; and 'prêtre assermenté' is better in every way. As regards the style and the arrangement of the materials, it is an ill-written and somewhat confused piece of biography, which seems to have been hurriedly put together, though it is the best account we have of M. Desgenettes. In other respects we do not wish to find fault with the *Notice Biographique*, which, on the whole, seems to contain a faithful and unvarnished account of the late Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, and is much freer from inflated and meaningless panegyric than we expected, though, of course, the biographer uses at times the superlative degree where the positive would have done just as well, and some of his statements must be received *cum grano*. There are, moreover, a few points connected with M. Desgenettes' life on which we should have desired further enlightenment. With reference to any future edition of M. Desgenettes' works that may appear, we would not take upon ourselves to advise his present editor to perform for them the same kind office which the accomplished editor of Bourdaloue, Cheminai, and Giroust, did for theirs, namely, to *retoucher* his sermons, though they are in great want of something of the sort. Should M. Desfossés venture upon the task, we doubt whether his editorial achievements would exactly deserve the eulogy which the Père De La Rue bestowed upon those of the Père Bretonneau, when he designated him, in the language which the Roman Church applies to S. Martin, as *trium mortuorum suscitator magnificus*. To retrench, on the other hand, any passages, would perhaps be a questionable piece of interference; possibly, however, the editor might point out how much the preacher was indebted to his predecessors. The task might prove an arduous one; but it would at least enable us to know, without, we believe, greatly detracting from the worthy Curé's fame, what is, and what is not M. Desgenettes', and prove an additional recommendation to his volumes.

ART. VII.—*On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity.* By
BADEN POWELL, M.A. F.R.S. &c. &c. Savilian Professor of
Geometry in the University of Oxford.

WE did not anticipate that any great amount of evil would arise from the publication of the volume of 'Essays and Reviews,' which has now for some months been the all absorbing topic of conversation in literary circles. We will not arrogate to ourselves the prophetic power of predicting that the actual results which it has produced have been exactly what might have been expected. In point of fact, we scarcely expected so public, so distinct and unequivocal, so unanimous a condemnation as has been passed upon it by the learned and the vulgar alike. It is of no use for the Essayists and their few adherents to disguise the fact that all the good and the great in the Church of England have pronounced sentence against them; that nearly every one competent to form an opinion has decided that their views are irreconcilably opposed to the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England; that the clergy, with a unanimity entirely unparalleled, have concurred in expressing their dissent from them, and that the laity have expressed more alarm at their denial of the faith than they have ever before done, at any, whether real or supposed, insincerity in their teachers. The writers have discovered that they have made a false move, that they have damaged the progress of Rationalism, within the pale of the Church of England, more than the youngest of their number can hope to see repaired even if he should live to extreme old age. The 'free-handling' for which, upon their own showing, the authors are responsible, has proved to be a mistake. Their friends are filled with dismay at the want of caution betrayed in speaking out so prematurely, and those from whom they had a right to expect countenance and support have, with scarcely an exception, joined the ranks of their opponents, and are careful to express their abhorrence of views which are only a little in advance of those which they have themselves advocated. The reaction which has set in since 1845, and has held a steady course from the publication of No. 90 of the 'Tracts for the Times,' has been abruptly checked, and dogmatic theology seems destined again to have a hearing.

Amidst, however, much reason for rejoicing at the storm of indignation which the publication of the volume has raised, there is no doubt reason, also, for fear that it will have contributed much to the unsettling of the faith of many. Infidel publica-

tions, however feeble their arguments may be, and however stale their objections to Christianity, will always find some readers who will be dazzled by their plausible show of reason, and who will be carried away by the apparent novelty of their assertions; and it is hopeless to expect that even this volume, ridiculous as are its pretensions to learning and logic, will entirely fail to shake the faith of weak and vacillating Christians. We have had little means of judging of its effects in this direction, whilst the results in the opposite direction have been most palpable and unmistakeable. Few, perhaps, will hear of the individuals whose faith may have been undermined by suggestions first met with in these pages; but no one can have witnessed the religious panic of the last six months without being aware that persons amongst whom the Essayists must naturally have expected supporters and abettors are amongst the foremost to condemn them. The party in the Church, which may in the main be represented by the *Christian Remembrancer*, was first in the field. The Evangelical party, through the *Christian Observer*, if they were unable to expose the fallacies, were at least honest enough to protest against the conclusions of the Essayists; and popular indignation, now that it has expressed itself in unequivocal language, has carried in its train nearly all the leaders of the Latitudinarian party, who, up to the time of the publication of the volume, had been actively engaged in preparing the way for its reception.

One bishop has been found, in the zeal of private friendship, chivalrous enough to hazard a few faltering appeals in deprecation of extreme measures being adopted. One writer, who, however, is anonymous, has ventured to put out a pamphlet of orthodox extracts from Mr. Jowett's writings, with the view, we presume, of throwing dust in people's eyes, and not, surely, with any persuasion that the effect of false statements can in any degree be done away with by any amount of assertions that are true. Meanwhile, an effort in the same direction is being made by the publication of a volume of sermons by the Head Master of Rugby, which will probably be in the hands of some of our readers before what we are now writing is in type.¹ We confess we have no curiosity to see this

¹ Since writing the above we have seen the volume of Sermons, which the author informs us in his preface are printed exactly as they were preached. We see no reason for any apology on the score of 'blemishes of style,' or omitted links of argument. We do not suppose that if they had been published under any circumstances, they would have been subjected to much alteration. Among the various reasons why the author thought proper to print them exactly as they were preached, of course the prominent one is that people may see that Dr. Temple has not altered them with reference to the present case. There is little that need be said about them, but that they are about equal to the average of school sermons,

volume. We know exactly the mould in which it will be cast. There will not be a word in it which will offend popular prejudices. It will not contain anything that is deep. It will be orthodox enough to satisfy any ordinary reader, and a few of the unlearned fathers and mothers who have sent their sons to Rugby will see in it a triumphant refutation of the unjust charges that have been made against Dr. Temple. Not so the class of people who are able to judge, and in this case the class will be a large one. The question with regard to both these writers will be, not What have they said that is true, and good, and beautiful? nor again, What is the character which they bear for purity of life and conscientiousness of action? People will see that it is entirely beside the momentous point at issue to examine what they have said on other occasions, except so far as it may explain doubtful and obscure allusions in this volume; or except, in any subsequent publication, they have retracted their errors and expressed regret for what they have written. After all that may be said or written upon the subject, it will be impossible to prevent the issue coming to these two questions in the mind of any fair and competent judge. Is it true or not that the Essayists have published a volume entirely subversive of the idea of Christianity commonly received in this country? And secondly will come a question of morality. Whether these views be in themselves true or false, are they consistent with the solemn profession of acknowledgment of, and hearty assent to the formularies of, the Church of England? Let the Essayists do what they will, and let their positions be impugned and defended to whatever extent they may, we say that it will be impossible to avoid this issue; and whatever may be the result of legal proceedings against individuals of their number, we are certain what will be the opinion of all persons of common honesty who are capable of forming a judgment upon the matter. With regard to replies which have been appearing in rapid succession, and which will, no doubt, continue to appear for some months yet, till this extraordinary excitement has somewhat subsided, we confess that we do not expect that they will do much good. For the most part they will of course be hasty and ill-considered productions. In these days when every body writes, so many will be found who have something to say upon some of the subjects controverted in these Essays, that we shall not be surprised if there is an average of a pamphlet to every page of the volume. And even where there is a solid

and that they are of very different degrees of strength. The eighteenth Sermon, on Confession, perhaps shows the greatest amount of inability to understand those who differ from the writer's view, as the assertion made at the beginning of it indicates an astounding ignorance as to the facts of the case.

answer given to any of the sceptical assertions or insinuations contained in the work, there will still remain the objection that the great mass of misstatements and errors remain just where they were; for, in point of fact, there is no single doctrine of the Christian faith that is not directly, or by implication, attacked in this publication. And here, before we enter upon the particular subject of this article, we may be permitted to add a few words as to this point which has been urged again and again by those who have not read the volume, and who have only become acquainted with it by means of the extraordinary commotion which it has caused. We have heard it alleged, and the allegation has certainly a show of truth, that the best way to silence these men is to answer them. No sensible person who has read the book would, we are persuaded, be guilty of the absurdity of making this suggestion; but as we may suppose that some even of the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* will not have read it, we must beg their indulgence, whilst we explain the impossibility of giving any complete, concise, and readable answer to such a tissue of arrogant assertions and unproved conclusions. To make what we have to say clear, we will make an extreme supposition. Suppose, then, a set of writers, with the view of setting aside the theory of moral obligation, in the general, or any particular form of it, had, in the course of their argument, taken it for granted that there was, of course, no supreme Creator of the Universe, no Being to whom the homage of mankind was due on the score of creation, preservation, redemption, or any other blessings, temporal or spiritual; suppose, moreover, that they had implied that this belief was now an exploded theory, or, if believed at all, certainly entitled to no credit, and not possessing any adherents among those who were learned and competent judges. Suppose that instead of attempting to prove that there was no God, they had assumed this as an axiomatic truth in the new theory of religion, and had interspersed their assertions with frequent sneers at the bigotry and intolerance of those who follow the current belief, and who are shocked at hearing it impugned, what course would the Christian world have adopted with regard to their notice of such a volume? For ourselves, we must give it as our opinion that such a work would have passed unnoticed, if it had come from the pen of writers who were known to be sceptics or atheists; and in the almost inconceivable case of such a work being published by professed believers in Christianity, most people would probably be satisfied with the denunciation of the writers for their hypocrisy in holding such inconsistent views, and for their fraud in endeavouring to persuade people that such views were commonly held. To continue. Suppose that it were resolved that such a volume

should not pass unnoticed, let us consider what course would have to be adopted. In the first place it would be necessary to attack the main purpose of the book, viz. under the present supposition the attempt to gainsay some principle of moral obligation. It would be necessary to exhibit the grounds upon which such principle stands, and it would be indispensable for the writer to expose the fallacy of the arguments adduced in disproof of it. When it is remembered how easy it is for a fool to raise objections which it may be extremely difficult for even a wise man to answer—it will not be thought surprising if the reply should occupy considerably more space than the attack. But in this case, the reply to the main argument of the volume would, in reality, be an insignificant portion of the refutation that would be required. There would still remain to be noticed every inuendo which suggested a state of belief which did not correspond to fact; and amongst other arguments, a whole treatise on natural theology would have to be written to answer objections to the doctrine of the existence of One Supreme Deity, which, differing in form from the often made, and as often answered, allegations on this subject, might require an answer couched under some variety of expression. If the writers in the course of their crude and ill-digested theories, had thrown out insinuations against other long believed and deeply cherished truths, the task of replying to them would be rendered still more difficult and complicated; and it is obvious that the final result would utterly fail of undoing the whole damage caused by the volume in question. It is certain that there would at the last remain many who could well understand the attack, but who would be far from appreciating the defence, and many more who would probably be quite able to estimate the case, but who would not take the trouble to master it, and who would be left in the unfortunate predicament of having doubts and difficulties suggested to their minds, the influence of which, in the absence of any solution to counteract them, would tell with damaging effect upon their life and conduct.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the supposition we have been making does not in any exact way represent the case of the Seven Essayists. As far as the results are concerned to certain individuals, as well as the difficulty of condensing a reply into any readable compass, the cases are exactly similar. The supposition we have made for the sake of representing the argument in a clearer light, as to the main purpose of the volume, does not correspond exactly with the state of the present case. The writers have not had it in view to attack directly any point of morality, but only to exhibit the advantage derivable generally to religion and morality, from a system of 'free-handling'

which seems to mean reckless putting out of superficial and ill-digested thoughts upon the most sacred subjects, in defiance of all the prejudices of ordinary Christians. Neither must we be led away into the error of supposing that what is the object of one Essay only, viz. Mr. Wilson's, is the object of the volume.

The writers, as a body, may certainly be acquitted of the charge of intending to show the honesty of asserting that you believe what you do not believe, which is the direct and only object of the Essay on the National Church. To uphold dishonesty is the purpose of this Essay, we repeat, but not the intention of the volume; though, in point of fact, we cannot see how the writers can be cleared of the charge of dishonesty, whilst they retain their positions in the Church. Again, there is another point in which the case we have been supposing does not exactly resemble that of the Essayists. They have not, as a body, thrown out insinuations against the Unity and Personality of the Divine Being. This may be thought to be the object of one of the Essays; but whatever there may be in this one Essay to countenance so grave a charge, it would be absurd to suppose that the Essayists, as a body, disbelieve in this fundamental truth of natural theology. The 'free-handling' has, in a single instance, led a writer into statements which amount to Pantheism, yet even he shrinks from avowing the conclusion of his own premises; and the other writers are entirely free from even the appearance of adopting so absurd a theory. With regard to the taking for granted that certain things, quite commonly believed amongst us, are now exploded by the learned, there is no difference between the case we have been supposing and the case now before us. Such, for instance, is the twice repeated insinuation that the Second General Epistle of S. Peter is a forgery, and, as such, not entitled to occupy a place in the Canon of Scripture. Now here is an insinuation twice made, and asserted, as it were indirectly and casually, without the faintest shadow of evidence brought forward to prove it. And this will serve to illustrate the mischievous nature of the volume. To do away with the effects of the few lines in which this assertion is made it would be requisite to write a treatise first to show that people in general, both learned and unlearned, are, in fact, agreed in accepting this epistle; and, secondly, to give all the evidence, internal as well as external, which would suffice to satisfy a fair mind of the falsity of the allegation implied in the expression, 'the genuine Epistle of Peter.'

It is our purpose in this paper to exhibit the whole amount of unproved statement in the late Professor Powell's Essay.

But before we proceed further, it may be worth while to

notice the only considerable defence that has been set up for the volume generally. It was, for a long time, scarcely understood why the two *Quarterly* Reviews, that have maintained their place the longest, and, perhaps, have still the widest circulation, preserved so entire a silence on what was occupying the minds of, at least, a very large section of the intellectual public. The volume had been out for nearly a year before the celebrated article in the *Quarterly* appeared, and more than a year when the counterblast came from the *Edinburgh*. The former of these articles appears to us, like almost every other article which we have met with, to have been fairly and temperately written. In one or two instances, it may, perhaps, have misrepresented the Essayists and Reviewers; but, upon the whole, it fairly represented the tone of the volume, and the relation in which it stood to Christianity. Its popularity is, perhaps, owing more to the wide circulation of the *Quarterly* than to its intrinsic merits. However, without stopping to discuss the merits of the case, it is certain that this article has been the main cause of the immense increase of the circulation of the volume reviewed, as well as of the number of the periodical in which it was reviewed. And as the *Quarterly* commends itself to the mass of its readers as being safe in religious matters, rather representing an antagonism to the High Church party, as well as to the Latitudinarian and the Puritan parties, it is not surprising that an article which first made known to the public at large the startling contents of a volume hitherto hardly known by name, should have propagated itself as it has done, and spread through the country in the shape of four editions of the January number of the *Quarterly*. One of the Essayists had died; one was a layman, and was entitled to hold and teach what he pleased without incurring the scandal which attached to clergy who had betrayed the faith they were pledged to maintain. The rest were in imminent danger. Whatever might be the result of legal measures adopted against them or their opinions, their influence was almost irretrievably ruined. Two of them, though by no means the most plain-spoken of the number, occupied positions of conspicuous eminence, as well as of considerable influence. It was worth while, for the sake of the party generally, to make an effort to preserve the reputations of Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett. Unless something was done, and that speedily, the numbers at Rugby would soon begin to diminish, and the students at Balliol to look shy upon the Regius Professor of Greek; and the result has been that one, whose interest it is to defend the tenableness of their position, but who does not care to endorse their opinions or commit himself to their views, has prevailed upon the *Edinburgh* to throw its shield over the unfortunate seven champions of hea-

thedom. No doubt it is a great advantage. It was the best move on the board. If the game was to be retrieved, it could only be done by enlisting on the side of the sceptics the political and religious parties represented by the *Edinburgh*, and the issue remains to be seen. Meanwhile, we may be allowed to express our surprise and our sorrow that the *Edinburgh Review* has lent itself to such a purpose. Still more must we regret the unscrupulous style in which the defence has been got up. We have called it a counterblast. It exactly represents the state of the case. The purpose of the writer is to destroy the influence of the notices of the volume published in the *Quarterly* at the commencement of this year, and the *Westminster* of last October, and then to represent the manifesto of the archbishops and bishops, and the expressed opinions of the clergy, whether in convocation or petitions, as entitled to no weight. With regard to these points, we have seldom seen in any review more wanton or more silly misrepresentations than this article contains. In order to disparage the enormous influence which the writer in the *Quarterly* has exercised on the present state of public opinion, it was found convenient, and that in the face of the plainest facts, which contradict the hypothesis, to attribute the origin of the movement to the previous notice of the volume in the *Westminster Review*, and then to characterise this latter notice as full of presumptuous ignorance, unscrupulous misrepresentation, and malignant insinuation; at the same time that the writer was denounced as one 'who combined with a profound ignorance of nearly all that had been written on the questions at issue an almost fanatical desire to inveigle those who stood on more secure positions to the narrow ledge of the precipice, on the midway of which he was himself standing.' And though almost every weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodical had noticed and condemned this volume, either previously to or simultaneously with the appearance of the 'Westminster manifesto,' the partisans of the two chief schools (we suppose the writer means the schools represented by the *Christian Remembrancer* and the *Christian Observer* respectively), are represented as catching up and eagerly echoing the note of the infidel journal. A writer who so freely accuses others of unscrupulous misrepresentation should himself have been more careful of his assertions.

It is not likely that people will believe, on the mere authority of an anonymous writer in the *Edinburgh*, that preachers read up the *Quarterly* on Saturday, and on the next morning denounced the writers from the pulpit as Atheists: and those who can recollect the quarrels of twenty-five years past will form their own opinion as to whether or not a black stain was left on the reputation of the writer by the celebrated 'Elucidations of

Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements.' It is not worth our while to follow this writer further. It would, however, be doing him injustice if we did not say that we think he has admirably played the part of counsel for the defence. He has raked up everything that could tell for his clients, and that could damage the opposite party; and where he was unable to make any case, as in the instance of Professor Powell's Essay, he has skilfully evaded the difficulty on the ground that its author has passed beyond the reach of literary criticism and ecclesiastical censure.

We shall dismiss it with the remark, that the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* seems to have undertaken not the cause of the Essayists in general, whom he is content to throw overboard, if only he can save the first and the last of the seven writers, Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett.

Before, however, we show up Professor Powell's rash assertions and sceptical conclusions, it may be worth while to give a few short extracts in proof of his orthodoxy, simply premising that, in our view, such evidence amounts to exactly as much as the defence which is said to have puzzled a jury so much in a celebrated case where seven persons were found to swear that they had witnessed a certain crime committed, and seven others declared that they had not seen it. Perhaps our extracts may save us from the imputation of wilfully withholding what may be said in the author's favour; and perhaps some of our readers who think they are not sufficient to counterbalance the heterodox opinions of the rest of the Essay, will apply the same argument to the case of Professor Jowett's Essay, and the 'Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice,' extracted from the published writings of Professor Jowett.

In the Essay, then, on the study of the evidences of Christianity, the author professes to believe that 'the essential doctrines of Christianity are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;' that 'objections are often urged in a manner and tone offensive to religious feeling and conscientious prepossessions which are entitled to respectful consideration.' That 'the early apologists were rather defenders of the Christian cause generally; but when they entered on evidential topics, naturally did so rather in accordance with the prevalent mode of thought, than with what would now be deemed a philosophical investigation of alleged facts, and critical appreciation of testimony in support of them.' Again:—'The argument from necessity of miracles is at best a very hazardous one, since it implies the presumption of constituting ourselves judges of such necessity, and admits the fair objection, when were miracles more needed than at the present day, to indicate

'the truth amid manifold error, or to propagate the faith?' Again:—'All reason and science conspire to the confession that beyond the domain of physical causation and the possible conceptions of *intellect* or *knowledge*, there lies open the boundless region of spiritual things which is the sole dominion of *faith*.'

The last quotation we will make shall be the concluding paragraph of the essay. '*The reason* of the hope that is in us is not restricted to external signs, nor to any one kind of evidence, but consists of such assurance as may be most satisfactory to each earnest individual inquirer's own mind. And the true acceptance of the entire revealed manifestation of Christianity will be most worthily and satisfactorily based on that assurance of faith by which the apostle affirms we stand (2 Cor. ii. 24); and which, in accordance with his emphatic declaration, must rest, not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God' (1 Cor. ii. 5). And now, before we proceed, let us entreat our readers to pause a moment, and to endeavour to bear in mind that a number of true statements produced from the works of a given historian are no sort of evidence as to his accuracy and truthfulness in the general, because there never was a book professing to be history written which did not contain a much larger amount of truth than of falsehood: let it also be remembered that the same holds still more strongly in a work of science. The most erroneous theory that ever was broached will admit of extracts being made from the work which contains its exposition, which may appear not only harmless and true but even of value and importance. Neither do we see why an Essay which may be considered partly historical, partly scientific, should be regarded as exempt from the same law. It will be understood, then, that the passages we have quoted have not been extracted from the volume before us with any object of contrasting them with others which will be produced in the sequel, but rather that the author may have the benefit of being judged by the reader according to them; for, certainly, they do appear to indicate an undoubting belief in a Christianity of some kind. We believe none of the author's own immediate friends profess to be able to comprehend how the Professor's view of the absolute immutability of the laws of nature as established already, or to be established hereafter by induction, is to be reconciled with the supernatural aspects of Revelation and Christianity.

The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of the Essay undoubtedly is this: that the regions of the spiritual and the physical are entirely distinct; that faith has its province in the former, science its dominion in the other.

That the ideas of 'the physical' and 'the spiritual' are in themselves abstractedly entirely distinct, is plain enough. That

mind and matter are distinct is a truth which is either identical with the above, or, at least, very nearly coincident with it. This cannot be denied; but then no thoughtful person will deny that the reciprocal influences of the physical and spiritual, the action of matter upon mind and the influence of mind over matter, are amongst the earliest and most familiar ideas we are conversant with; and, undoubtedly, the form of Christianity to which we have been accustomed seems to recognise some very intimate relations between them. We are not combating the position of our author, but only illustrating our own meaning, when we refer to the doctrine of sacramental grace, as implying very definite and very mysterious relations between the physical and the spiritual world. In what sense the Essay about which we are treating implies, in some parts of it, a belief in these things, we need not inquire.

That all such belief must be given up before the reader can adopt the Essay as a whole, will appear plainly enough in the sequel, because these are only particular instances of effects which will not fit in to natural causes, and which must therefore be discarded as not amenable to the tests of induction. But this distinction between the worlds of faith and of reason, enables the author, as he thinks, to accept Christianity as a matter of faith, at the same time that he takes exception to all the ordinarily received credentials of Christianity, and especially to the miracles to which it appeals as one part of those credentials. That the value of miracles has been overrated, and that especially when the argument has been isolated from the other evidences of Christianity, we most fully admit. We do not indeed doubt that the effect of the cumulative argument, from external and internal evidence, from prophecy and miracle combined, its adaptation to the necessities of human nature, and the like, have been often pressed much too far, as if they contained a sort of mathematical demonstration from which it was impossible to escape. The necessity of a willing mind and a tractable disposition seems, in the course of these arguments, to have been much lost sight of, whereas this is in fact the only key by which in most cases the resistance to such strong evidence can be accounted for. Yet, though miracles must not be made too much of, as if they were adequate to an effect which God has made to rest upon several independent witnesses; and though it is perhaps conceivable that Christianity might have been propagated without any distinctly miraculous interference; and though it were admitted that all other alleged miracles could be explained, or were likely some day to be explained, as instances of higher laws of the physical world, beyond our present inductions, but which were hereafter to be established as laws of nature, it

must not be forgotten that Christianity has, so to say, staked its credit on one particular miraculous fact. The Apostles were witnesses of the Resurrection. This they professed themselves to be, and specially appointed one in addition to their number of eleven, for the express purpose of bearing witness to the same fact; and nothing can be plainer than S. Paul's asseveration that Christianity is a mere fiction if the Resurrection is not a fact. Now, the main position which the late Professor Powell assumes, and in defence of which he thought it sufficient to urge the distinction between the ideas of mind and of matter, the absolute independence of the material and the spiritual worlds, is, that a miracle in the physical world is impossible. Now, we are not going to accuse the writer of actual disbelief in Christianity. Nothing would be gained to our argument, which is only concerned with his Essay, if it could be proved that he was a mere unbeliever.

A man's mind may be so singularly constituted that, professing an unhesitating belief in some elementary truth of geometry, he shall yet deny that which follows from it as a necessary and immediate consequence. We may express our wonder at the fact, which, in a psychological point of view, may be of the highest interest and importance; but in dealing with the truths of the case, we may be content to show that no *reasonable* person can consistently hold the one truth without holding the other also; and the method of doing so would of course be to prove the one from the other. Let, then, Professor Powell's idiosyncrasy have all the benefit that can possibly be allowed it; but let us not be called uncharitable if we show that, upon his own argument, the Essayist ought to be an unbeliever. We will pass by the fact that he who professes a belief in a Christianity without miracles, professes a belief in an entirely different thing from what is ordinarily understood by the term Christianity, because certain miracles, as such, are an essential part of the working of Christianity. We are only going now to consider that cardinal miraculous fact on which, as we have said, the credit of Christianity is staked, and by which it must stand or fall. Well, then, he who professes to receive Christianity, and disbelieves in the possibility of miracles, must adopt one of two courses with regard to the fact of the Resurrection of our blessed Lord from the grave. Either he must deny the physical fact, or, admitting the fact, he must assert that it is an ordinary instance of a law of nature. We use the word *assert*, for it will not be contended that a resurrection from the dead is as yet proved to be a law of nature, whatever probability there may be hereafter of its taking its place among the ordinary phenomena of the physical world. And with

regard to this part of the alternative, we say that it is a very bold and unwarrantable assertion, and one that requires a good deal of evidence to make it appear probable to ordinary minds. A fact of history, which does not exemplify any known law, must rest upon the evidence of sense, or upon that of testimony; and in the present case, where sense is excluded, there only remains the evidence of testimony. The whole question is as to the adequacy of the testimony. Let us hear what Professor Baden Powell says on this point:—

'In appreciating the evidence for any events of a striking or wonderful kind, we must bear in mind the extreme difficulty which always occurs in eliciting the truth, dependent not on the uncertainty in the transmission of testimony, but even in cases where we were ourselves witnesses, on the enormous influence exerted by our prepossessions previous to the event, and by the momentary impressions consequent upon it. We look at all events, through the medium of our prejudices, or even where we may have no prepossessions, the more sudden and remarkable any occurrence may be, the more unprepared we are to judge it accurately or to view it calmly; our after representations, especially of any extraordinary and striking event, are always at best mere recollections of our impressions, of ideas dictated by our emotions at the time, of surprise and astonishment which the suddenness and hurry of the occurrence did not allow us time to reduce to reason, or to correct by the sober standard of experience or philosophy.

'Questions of this kind are often perplexed for want of due attention to the laws of human thought and belief, and of due distinction in ideas and terms. The proposition "that an event may be so incredible intrinsically as to set aside any degree of testimony," in no way applies to or affects the honesty or veracity of that testimony, or the reality of the impressions on the minds of the witnesses, so far as it relates to the matter of sensible fact simply. It merely means this: that from the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of some kind of mistake or deception somewhere, though we know not where, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in the way and from the causes assigned.

'This of course turns on the general grounds of our antecedent convictions. The question agitated is not that of mere testimony, of its value, or of its failures. It refers to those antecedent considerations which must govern our entire view of the subject, and which being dependent on higher laws of belief, must be paramount to all attestation, or rather belong to a province distinct from it. What is alleged is a case of the supernatural; but no testimony can reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon: that it is due to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumptions of the parties.'—Pp. 106, 107.

Well, then, as the denial of the actual fact of the Resurrection is not to be thought of,—for then, to use logical language, *cadit quæstio*; that we suppose will be admitted to be tantamount to a denial of Christianity, involving either deception or imposture on the part of its first propagators,—we must inquire under what category it is to be placed. Obviously it is to be received as one of those facts which are in the course of time to be included under the generalizations of science.

And here we must guard ourselves against a possible misrepresentation. Observe, then, it is no question here whether the Resurrection itself, in common with all other miracles, may not be referable to some higher law of God's dealings into which it may fit as easily as those other laws of which it appears to be an infraction. Neither party in the dispute at all denies the probability of this. Indeed, if one may speak reverently on a subject which must, except under a new revelation, for ever remain uncertain, it seems to us more consonant to our views of the Divine Nature, that there should be absolute uniformity (whether ever, or how far, to be recognised by His creatures is another point) in the divine operations.

Such uniformity may, for all we know, be implied in the Unity of God. But the question which the Essayist must decide in the affirmative is, whether there is any probability of the Resurrection hereafter taking its place, as an exemplification of some physical law discoverable by man, or whether inductive science is at all pointing in that direction. We need not complicate the matter by going on to press the argument in the case of the Ascension. Whether, for instance, any indications in the theory of gravitation, seem likely to include this fact in the more general law which has to be invented or discovered, for its sake—we are content to take the Resurrection, which, as we have said, is the cardinal point of the evidence for Christianity. It is almost too puerile a supposition to make, and we almost fear we owe our readers an apology for putting the case. The only excuse we can urge for noticing so absurd a theory is, that the theorist was a man of great eminence in scientific pursuits, and that the theory has found admission into a volume which professes to illustrate the 'advantages derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment.'

Professor Powell, then, was bound to show that the Resurrection was likely some day to take its place as a physical fact representative of a physical law, hereafter to be elicited by induction from a comparison of the phenomena of nature. We do not of course pretend to think that he would, for the sake of logical consistency, have avowed a belief in anything so monstrous and preposterous,—and if we have shown that the Essayist cannot escape from the charge of absolute infidelity except by the adoption of a logical contradiction, let us hope that the theory is due to some aberration of intellect, arising from an excessive eagerness to magnify the importance of inductive science, the certainty of its conclusions, and the comprehensiveness of its sphere of application. Let us hope what each may be able to

hope of the individual, but do not let us be imposed upon by vague denunciations of want of charity for exposing a worthless theory to the scorn and contempt which it merits, because its author has passed into a world where human judgment can no longer affect him for good or for evil.

We have said that the *αἰτίων ψεύδος* of the Essay is the treating the physical and the spiritual as if they had no common ground. We proceed to point out some other assumptions made by the same author, with the view of showing that readers must not trust the unproved assertions even of eminent mathematicians. In illustration of his main position, the author asserts that (p. 128), the more knowledge advances, the more it has been, and will be acknowledged that Christianity, as a real religion, must be viewed apart from connexion with physical things. This is an aphorism which we need not have noticed, as it is only a corollary from the previous proposition; but we have copied it down, because there is a slight show of evidence brought to support the position.

The argument stands as follows:—

'The first dissociation of the spiritual from the physical was rendered necessary by the palpable contradictions disclosed by astronomical discovery with the letter of Scripture. Another still wider and more material step has been effected by the discoveries of geology. More recently the antiquity of the human race, and the development of species, and the rejection of the idea of "creation," have caused new advances in the same direction.

'In all these cases there is, indeed, a direct discrepancy between what had been taken for revealed truth and certain undeniable existing monuments to the contrary.

'But these monuments were interpreted by science and reason, and there are other deductions of science and reason referring to alleged events, which, though they have left no monuments or permanent effects behind them, are not the less legitimately subject to the conclusions of positive science, and require a similar concession and recognition of the same principle of the independence of spiritual and physical truth.'—P. 129.

Now here are alleged three so-called discoveries of modern geological science, and others alluded to in evidence of the entire independence of Christianity of physical things; and we have to observe that one of the three discoveries is a mere fancy of the writer's, that there is no such thing as creation; a second is a recently invented theory, which has met with little or no countenance from those scientific men who are most capable of judging of it; and the remaining one, of the antiquity of the human race being greater than was supposed, is a guess supported by a very few facts, and what appears as yet a very gratuitous supposition of exact uniformity in the amount of river deposits for many centuries; what the deductions of science and reason are which point in the same direction we are left to conjecture, so we can say nothing about them. The three that

are adduced, are somewhat shaky props for any hypothesis ; but supposing them to be all true, surely they would not prove that Christianity was independent of physical things, but that the Scriptures of the Old Testament had been wrongly interpreted, according to the erroneous physical theories which have prevailed, but which are now exploded. The inaccuracy of writing appears the more glaring in a writer who had previously published a volume devoted to the subject of representing the entire separation between Judaism and Christianity, and the uselessness of the Old Testament to those who are in possession of the New.

Here, then, are three unproved assertions which nobody believes, which are taken for undoubted truths, and which are brought in evidence for a conclusion with which they have no connexion whatever. Why this author so completely abstains from allusion to the miracles of the New Testament, it is very difficult to guess. If we may hazard a conjecture, we should say that the Professor's attention has been so engrossed in those physical sciences which have been brought under the dominion of mathematical science, and those most immediately connected with them, as entirely to have overlooked the miracles of the New Testament; these being, upon the whole, somewhat of a distinct character from those of the Old Testament, and being more exclusively concerned with human health and life. Certain it is, if the Savilian Professor had been fair, he was bound not to have kept out of sight the Conception and Birth of our Blessed Lord, and His Ascension into heaven ; either of which miracles would have answered our purpose nearly as well as that of the Resurrection, in our attempt to show that Christianity must be embraced with its miracles of fact, or else must be sacrificed together with them. Such cardinal facts as these stand upon a different ground, if we may say so, from many other miracles, even of the New Testament ; to take, for instance, any single miracle which we will suppose related only by one evangelist, and to which no very definite allusion is made elsewhere in the sacred writings. We will suppose, for instance, the cure of the man at the pool of Bethesda. It is conceivable that one may be a believer in Christianity, and yet either disbelieve or explain away this particular miracle. Supposing, for instance, that instead of the genuineness of one verse of it, that of the whole account had been doubtful, there would have been nothing remarkable if we found sincere believers in Christianity rejecting it as wanting sufficient authority ; or, again, in these days of doubt and questioning, explaining and accounting for things, it would be conceivable that persons admitting the idea of the miraculous should endeavour to represent this case as one which

exhibited the natural appearances of cause and effect. We do not say it would be reasonable; but there are many things which might be said, and which have, in point of fact, been said of this miracle, more or less plausible, with the view of denuding it of its miraculous character. The disease was fanciful; the man seemed worse than he was, or he was a mere impostor, pretending, for some purpose of his own, to be afflicted with a malady under which he was not suffering. We are really almost ashamed to make the suppositions which have been made by German Rationalists to get rid of the miraculous character of a transaction, the external facts of which are undeniable. Those of our readers to whom such things are new, may see many more by referring to Paulus, or to Mr. Powell's volume, entitled 'Christianity not Judaism.' We are not pleading, it will be observed, for the reasonableness of such interpretations, or even for their consistency with the admission of the truths of Christianity; on the contrary, we think them absolutely ridiculous. But what we want to impress upon the readers of 'Essays and Reviews' now is, that such a miracle as this is distinguished from the miracles of the Birth, Resurrection, and Ascension, in that these latter are crucial instances. Christianity has, as we have said, staked itself upon the second; and as to the other two, the impugnors of the miracle cannot adopt any other hypothesis of Christianity than some offshoot of the Socinian heresy.

We proceed with the unproved assertions of Professor Powell. The proposition implied in the following extract is, that *human* beings are entirely distinct from *matter* and from *physical* causes:—

'A great source of misapprehension in this class of arguments has been the undue confusion between the force of *testimony* in regard to human affairs and events in history, and in regard to physical facts. It may be true that some of the most surprising occurrences in ordinary history are currently, and perhaps correctly accepted, on but slight grounds of real testimony; but then they relate to events of a kind which, however singular in their particular concomitant circumstances, are not pretended to be beyond natural causes, or to involve higher questions of intervention.'

'The most seemingly improbable events in human history may be perfectly credible, on sufficient testimony, however contradicting ordinary experience of human motives and conduct—simply because we cannot assign any limits to the varieties of human dispositions, passions, or tendencies, or the extent to which they may be influenced by circumstances of which, perhaps, we have little or no knowledge to guide us. But no such cases would have the remotest applicability to alleged violations of the laws of matter, or interruptions of the course of physical causes.'—P. 132.

In the next extract which we shall make, perhaps some readers will denounce at least one passage as downright atheism. It is not with the view of eliciting any such condemnation that we

produce it, but only as additional evidence of the immense amount of unproved assertion with which this Essay abounds.

'It is for the most part hazardous ground for any general moral reasoner to take, to discuss subjects of evidence which essentially involve that higher appreciation of physical truth which can be attained only from an accurate and comprehensive acquaintance with the connected series of the physical and mathematical sciences. Thus, for example, the simple but grand truth of the law of conservation, and the stability of the heavenly motions, now well understood by all sound cosmical philosophers, is but the type of the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature. Yet the difficulty of conceiving this truth in its simplest exemplification was formerly the chief hindrance to the acceptance of the solar system—from the prepossession of the peripatetic dogma that there must be a constantly acting moving force to keep it going. This very exploded chimera, however, by a singular infatuation, is now actually revived as the ground of argument for miraculous interposition by redoubtable champions who, to evince their profound knowledge of mechanical philosophy, inform us "that the whole of nature is like a mill, which cannot go on without the continual application of a moving power."—P. 134.

Now, supposing the stability of the heavenly motions to be established as an incontrovertible truth, we ask what right has any philosopher to argue from it for the universal self-sustaining and self-ruling powers which pervade our nature? For this is the meaning of the expression used, when stability is spoken of as the *type* of self-evolution. What has stability to do with self-evolution? or what has physical philosophy to do with *types* at all, except in the way of suggesting what it is its business to prove? But, again, we have not done with the argument yet—this author is absolutely greedy of fallacies; he is not content with one fallacy, that the conclusion does not follow from the premises—the premise itself must involve an assumption also. For such of our readers as are not astronomers, we will briefly explain this 'grand truth of the law of conservation and the stability of the heavenly motions.'

In the solar system, each revolving planet disturbs every other planet; and it is conceivable that bodies should have been created of such relative magnitude, and revolving in such orbits, that their disturbances might have in time accumulated, and the whole system have become entirely deranged. Newton's theory of gravitation, with the then existing methods of calculation, did not reach so far as to demonstrate what is called the stability of the system. It was reserved for Laplace to demonstrate, from the fact that the planets all move in the same direction, from the smallness of the eccentricity of their orbits, and their slight inclination to each other, that the secular inequalities are periodical, and that there is a mean state of the planetary system, about which it will oscillate, never very materially deviating from it. The proof of this is one of the

most exquisitely beautiful instances of the power of mathematical analysis.

But the point to be observed here is, that the whole of this calculation is made upon an hypothesis which is far from being certain—viz. the non-existence of any medium in space capable of retarding the motions of the heavenly bodies. Whether there be such a medium or not is still a point undecided. It is, however, the opinion of physical philosophers of the first eminence, that the supposition of such a medium affords the best explanation of the regular apparent acceleration of the motion of Encke's comet. We are not here concerned with the truth of the hypothesis; it is sufficient to allude to the light which is thrown by it upon the evidence for the self-sustaining powers which pervade all nature.

The supposition of a thin atmosphere pervading that portion of space occupied by the solar system, is certainly a gratuitous supposition, but it *may* be true; and if it is true, it involves the extinction of that system; and then the self-evolving power of nature will have to be based upon a different set of facts from the stability of the planetary orbits.

The point for the reader's consideration here, is the amount of credulity as to physical hypothesis, in contrast with the scornful tone adopted as regards religious truth, and the facts of Christianity which rest on human testimony. Running parallel with, and interpenetrating all the fallacies of this Essay, is the idea which the author never loses sight of, of the worthlessness of human testimony to events which seem to impugn any supposed law of nature. The author apparently shelters himself under the allegation that all such apparent contradictions will be found to fit into a more general law. Such expectation in the ordinary case of natural things is most just and reasonable; but it is a mere assumption, like every other statement of the Essay, that every exception to which human testimony bears witness, must some day fit in to a law cognizable by us. The author considers this matter quite settled by distinguishing the two cases to which testimony is applied, viz. 'historical events,' and 'physical facts.' With the former he denies that it has anything to do, reserving its whole value for cases which it may render credible, on the ground of our ignorance of the variation of human disposition, passion, and tendency, and the incalculable influence of circumstances. Well, what does this amount to, but that testimony is worthless against facts which we know to be true, and of which we know all the bearings and circumstances which can possibly influence them? And what single truth, we ask, is there of which this can be said, excepting the truths of intuition or deduction? And how of these could it

he affirmed that we know all the circumstances which can influence them, unless it were because they are absolutely independent of time and circumstance? It is at this point that the most ridiculous blunder, the most palpable absurdity of Professor Powell's Essay occurs. Here is a writer whose acuteness enables him to distinguish between historical events and physical facts, because it suits his theory to do so. He comes forward as the one of the seven whose province it is to advocate the claims of physical science. Mental science he does not profess. He will leave that to Mr. Buckle, of whom, by the way, we may express our astonishment that he has not been associated with the seven. Professor Powell had not knowledge enough of metaphysics or statistics to include the phenomena of mind under the unalterable laws of causation. Neither does he care to do so. We must say we think the 'Essays and Reviews' would have been a much more complete attack upon Christianity, if they had taken the author of 'The History of Civilization' into their number. Really it is expecting too large an amount of credulity in readers to ask them to assent to the self-evolving and self-developing powers of nature—and then believe in the exclusion of the most perfect work of nature from the possession of the same powers of self-improvement; for it must be remembered that Dr. Temple's colossal man of the nineteenth century by no means comes up to this idea of things. Professor Powell's province is, as we have said, physical science, and the seven writers proclaim their independent action. Undoubtedly there are inconsistencies enough to indicate the most ludicrous mismanagement, if there were any common purpose in the seven Essays; we do not know whether that purpose was, but we do know that the result obtained has been the throwing doubts upon all that people have hitherto held sacred.

But we have been carried away from our present subject, which is the third Essay of the series. The author, as we have seen, makes a broad distinction between historical events and physical facts, and is apparently unconscious that there is any truth independent of these two classes. We do not ask of a sceptical writer on physical science to admit that there are abstract truths in morals, the certainty of which is to some minds greater than that of any historical fact accredited by whatever amount of testimony, or than any law of physical science, however extensively it may appear to account for natural phenomena. We do not care to put before such a writer the elementary truths of the existence of a God, the idea of duty, the supremacy of conscience, and a thousand other truths deducible from or in any way connected with these; but we think it is not expecting much of a mathematician, when we require

him to distinguish between the laws of the material world in operation, and the same as they exist abstractedly from matter. Such a writer might have known that the connexion between the supposed law of gravitation and the elliptic orbit would have held as truth, though there had never been a particle of matter to suggest or to exemplify it, though there had never been a human mind with powers to grasp it. Such an one might have known, from the history of science, that other suppositions have been made, which for aught we know might be true, but which never have been exemplified, but that this does not interfere in the least degree with the truth of the conclusions deducible from such suppositions. And, above all things, it might have been expected of one whose accomplishments extend over the whole range of pure mathematical science, as well as over all those physical sciences which induction has brought under the dominion of mathematical science, that he should have recognised the elementary truths of numbers, as having an eternal and unchangeable existence. We must quote the exact words, or no one will believe that we are not misrepresenting the Professor. In objecting to the doctrine, that 'on a certain amount of testimony we might believe any statement however improbable,' he urges the following (p. 141): 'So that if a number of respectable witnesses were to concur in asseverating that on a certain occasion they had seen two and two make five, we should be bound to believe them! This, perhaps, it will be said is an extreme case.' Now we ask any person however ignorant of philosophy, just to consider for a moment—how it is possible for an abstract proposition to be borne testimony to. We always have supposed that testimony could only apply to alleged facts. The testimony may be true or false, credible or incredible; but the thing testified to, must be testified to as a fact, not as an abstract truth. A man might assert that he perceived or knew what was going on in another part of the world at a given moment, he might say that he had seen an angle trisected, he might persist in his belief that he had seen the sun move from west to east—or any other fact equally unlikely, or, as Professor Powell might express it, equally impossible; but, the testimony alleged applies to a single fact, and not to a law of the material world, nor to an abstract truth independent of matter. Thus a person might be insane enough, or ignorant enough, to impugn the law of gravitation, but he could not bear testimony against the law itself in the abstract. He would only allege that he had seen a fact which overthrew it, which he could not account for, which was inconsistent with it. The law is cognisable not by sense but by intellect. Facts to which testimony applies are objects of sense.

And now let us imagine this extreme case of the very remarkable individual, who should assert that he had seen two and two make five. We do not deny that such words might possibly be used by a lunatic, as anything might be said to which either no meaning, or any vagueness of meaning might be attached by the speaker. But we are supposing people with the same amount of sense and of reason that falls to the lot of mankind in general, and we want to know how this extreme case could be put. It will be admitted, that though people can see two things, they cannot see the number two in the abstract. So that any one who should testify to two and two making five, would have to state that he had seen two individual persons or things, and other two individual persons or things, which, when apart, seemed to him to be two in one place, and two in another. And now these two and two persons or things have to be added together. Now, we want to know, how the process of addition is to be witnessed or described. Two and two can be added together in mind—how is the process to be gone through in fact? We suppose by placing them together. And the testimony borne would probably be somewhat of this nature. Two groups of two separate individuals when united, appeared instead of making four when combined, to produce five individuals. It would really make a very poor conjuring trick. But no conjurer, we suppose, however much he might wish to delude his spectators, would hope to convince them that on every other occasion two and two would appear as five.

A writer who makes such a ridiculous mistake forfeits all character for philosophy, and all right to be heard; neither would it be at all worth while to notice such nonsense were it not for the extraordinary sensation produced by this volume. As it is, we fear many of our readers will consider we have been wasting words upon a matter that is too clear to require argument. All we want to establish is, that writers who make such ludicrous mistakes have no right to be considered philosophers, and that their opinions on matters which they do not prove, are not entitled to carry any weight with them.

We have already seen ample reason for distrusting the unproved assertions of Professor Powell. We have never met with any writings with so great an amount of scepticism in one direction and credulity in another. It is a wonderful instance to show that even first-rate attainments in mathematical science may fail to discipline the mind and enable it to weigh evidence. It has often and with truth been objected against a mathematical education, that it tends towards scepticism, by placing the mind continually in the position of doubting, and, in fact, encouraging it in disbelief in what is not rigidly proved. We think this result might have

been expected *à priori*, and there can be little doubt that in fact many great mathematicians have been great sceptics, if not positive disbelievers in Revelation. But Professor Powell is more eminent for his physical attainments than for mathematical skill. We believe he was considered at one time the greatest authority in this country on the subject of physical optics; and it has always been thought that the sobriety of mind required in inductive science would act as a counterpoise to the defects which deductive processes in pure science were supposed to generate. We have ourselves always entertained the opinion that any science which tended to develop one class of mental faculties would form a dangerous study for young minds. Hence arises the advantage of varying the kinds of subjects to which young minds are accustomed; but no amount of education will ensure the mind against sceptical tendencies so long as there is any connexion between faith and morals. It is, after all, with the heart that man believeth; and though no system can be produced which can bear any comparison, in point of consistency with itself, and reasonable evidence, with revealed Christianity, yet this consideration will weigh very little with such persons as have not a corresponding evidence within to meet external evidences. Under existing circumstances it may seem a little ungracious to insist on this truth, but it is the one truth that is specially kept out of sight by most of the Essayists. The whole matter is treated as a thing of intellectual evidence. This view is most painfully evident throughout Professor Powell's Essay. The Essay is written just as if it would cost the author nothing to give up Christianity, if the case were proved against it; and he seems unable to entertain the view that, in such a case, it would cost one who had been a sincere believer any pain to surrender all the convictions of his life, and the truths which from infancy he had learned to cherish and revere.

We scarcely know whether we have yet put before the reader who has not read this Essay for himself, an adequate description of it; and will add a few words as to the portions of it which have been but lightly touched upon. Let us repeat, then, that the Essayist professes to write in the interest of truth when he denies the possibility of physical miracles. It may seem strange to persons who have been accustomed to view miracles as one of the credentials of Christianity, particularly to such as have too implicitly relied on the authority of Paley, whose argument is in the main correct, though containing occasional incautiousness of expression; it may seem strange that the denial of miracles should be pressed on the ground of advantage to the Christian faith; yet so it is; and the author has skilfully availed himself of the overstatements on the other side of the question, to support

his theory. Thus he attacks what he considers the main assertion of Paley, 'that it is impossible to conceive a revelation given except by means of miracles.' But surely there is plenty of room for standing-ground between the two assertions, that revelation *must* have been given by miracles, and that it could not have been given in this way. One may surely shrink from either assertion, and calmly examine the question, whether, in point of fact, it has been attended by miraculous agency. It is certain that if it has not, it loses all claim to belief, for, as we have observed again and again, it stakes its credit upon a miracle.

Premising, then, what we surely are at liberty to premise, that we have already shown the absurdity of the attempt to reconcile a reception of Christianity with the denial of miraculous agency; premising also that the *Essay* has shown no shadow of reason for the denial of miracles, which denial rests solely on the unproved assertion of the author, that it is inconceivable that the laws of nature should be interfered with; we will say a few words as to Professor Powell's professed object,—viz. the vindication of the Christian faith at the expense of the credibility of miracles.

The author truly observes, that the view of evidence in general, and of miraculous evidence in particular, is mainly a Protestant view, and has grown up since the Reformation; being a product, as it were, of the inquiring, doubtful tone of mind, generated partly by the corrupt state of the Church, partly by the general diffusion of thought through the printing-press. Neither can it well be denied that the prevailing view of miracles advocated in part of the seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth century, was something like an appeal to the intellect to be convinced of the truth of Christianity by certain facts, which made no more appeal to man's moral nature than so many conjuring tricks might be supposed to do. Again, it must be acknowledged that, upon comparison of the tone of earlier works with those of later date, and of these again, with writings of our own day, we find a great change in the tastes and opinions of the times. Earlier writers have been superseded by later; and especially there arose a necessity for the Protestant principle, if it was to retain its ascendancy, to invent some method of discrediting ecclesiastical miracles which should not have the effect of disparaging those of Scripture. We need not follow the author through his attack upon the clumsy view of Warburton, which suggested the necessity of the miracles as a criterion of its truth. To any believer in the Old Testament, it is evident the miracles of Elisha must be sacrificed on this principle; but Professor Powell, who treats the Old Testament as a thing of the past, entirely to be forgotten, does not, of course, urge this argument. Neither need more be said here of Douglas'

criterion, viz. the connexion of inspiration with miraculous power, except that it is eminently unsatisfactory. Neither are we concerned to discuss the comparative evidence for ecclesiastical miracles as distinct from Scriptural. Whether there are any difficulties specially belonging to the former, and of what nature they are,—which may be considered fairly substantiated, and which, on the contrary, must be pronounced destitute of sufficient proof, are very interesting questions; but they are beside the present point, as even on the supposition of their entire falsehood, the truth of Christianity, as a whole, may fairly dispense with them, and rest upon the evidences of miraculous power possessed and displayed by our Lord and His apostles. What the author alleges may be admitted, that (p. 102) ‘the appeal was mainly to the miracles of the Gospels,’ but when he adds that ‘here it was contended we want merely the same testimony of eye-witnesses which would suffice to substantiate any ordinary matter of fact,’ we have another of those numerous instances of unproved assertion and misrepresentation with which the Essay, and, we may add, the whole volume, abounds. We never have seen it alleged anywhere, neither do we believe it ever has been urged, that an alleged miracle is *prima facie* as credible as an ordinary event; an ordinary event is believed as a matter of course on the statement of an ordinary individual; it is only when the event is unusual and unlikely that people suspend their judgment till additional testimony confirms the truth of what they have heard. So that it is a mere misrepresentation of the case to accuse writers on the evidences of Christianity of affirming that *merely* the same testimony is required for a miracle which would satisfy people as to any common matter of fact.

Moreover, the Professor tacitly implies, both here and elsewhere, that each alleged miracle should separately be (we do not say examined, which would be sufficiently unfair, but) dismissed from consideration on the *à priori* ground of the impossibility of miraculous interference; whereas, in point of fact, the case has a right to be considered as a whole.

It is not like the case of persons testifying to a fact which has come under their observation, and of which they do not profess to know more than what is palpable to sense, a fact which they leave for the scientific to investigate and make what they can of. Many people were convinced, for instance, that tables turned round without sufficient mechanical power being applied to account for such turning. Yet such people did not, at least in many cases, believe there was anything supernatural or inexplicable in the matter. But the miracles of the New Testament, it must be remembered, are many, and are alleged both by the

workers themselves and by Christians now, as supernatural events, and as parts of a large system, embracing a great many other somewhat similar events, some of them quite like ordinary matters of history, and some for instance, as S. Paul's shaking off the viper, which it would be difficult to class with either kind of events; and cures which, without being distinctly miraculous, produced similar effects with those ascribed to miraculous agency. Now it will be said that, in all this, we are not touching Professor Powell's argument, which is professedly directed not against Christianity, which he adopts, but against the miraculous evidence for Christianity, which he rejects; but we have, we think, at least the right to demand of one who rejects what the Christian world universally holds, to substitute some explanation of the miracles recorded in the Acts of the Apostles in place of the commonly received acceptance of them, as attestations of the power conferred by Christ upon His apostles. The author, in a previously published volume, which was, two years ago, noticed in this *Review*, gave us an analysis of what others thought of some of the New Testament miracles; but we are not aware that he has ever elaborated a theory of his own, which shall dispose of the awkward facts of the cure at the Beautiful gate of the Temple, the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira, the blindness inflicted on Elymas, the cure of the impotent man at Lystra, the casting out of the spirit of divination at Philippi, and others. We omit the notice of the recoveries wrought at Ephesus by means of the handkerchiefs and aprons brought from S. Paul to the sick, as well as the raising from the dead, as being results which the author might attribute to fancy, and so class under the head of the spiritual world. We think it must be admitted that, whatever may be said of any one of the above-quoted miracles, yet, taken together, they form a body of facts singularly awkward to account for on any other supposition than the existence of a power which could and which did interfere with the ordinary laws of nature. However, the view with which these are here alleged is to exhibit the amount of unproved statement in this Essay; we need not insist upon the fact that these instances are tolerably strong evidence in *disproof* of the fundamental view advocated by Professor Powell.

Still, Professor Powell's view is, as we have said, to defend Christianity at the expense of miracles. That the theory is demonstrably untenable, under every view of it that can be taken, is true enough indeed; but that is not our immediate object to maintain. His position seems to be that of a man who has associated much with scientific men of various shades of belief and unbelief, and who has been especially struck by the notion which is expressed by Theodore Parker in the illogical

language, that a miracle is impossible, because everywhere there is found law, as the constant mode of operation of an infinite God—(we should like much to know how nature and nature's laws prove the infinity of God)—otherwise and somewhat more logically expressed by Wegscheider, that 'the belief in a super-natural, miraculous, immediate revelation of Himself seems, not very reconcilable with the idea of an everlasting God, of unchangeable purpose.' The position which the Protestant principle seems in our day forced to adopt, is that of surrendering in succession such doctrines of the faith as are objected to by persons who wish to retain some vestiges of Christianity, or who are unable wholly to divest themselves, as Mr. F. Newman has succeeded in doing, of the prejudices of early education. Thus, one comes forward as the advocate of universal restitution; another surrenders the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice and propitiation; and the last phase of development is represented in Professor Powell's attempt to make Christianity palatable to those who reject its principal credentials. The Essayist argues that it is not the facts about which people are at issue in any alleged case of miraculous interference, but the assigning the right interpretation to those facts, the ascribing them to their true causes. Now, this in many cases, even of miracles recorded in Scripture, is quite true. The same may be observed of many alleged extraordinary occurrences of ancient and modern times. Take, for instance, the miraculous recovery of sight worked by Vespasian. There may be a question raised as to how the thing was done, but the facts of the case are incontestable. Again, the cures of the malady called 'the king's evil,' by the royal touch, cannot be denied. The true account of them may, perhaps, be different from the following, as given by Bishop Bull (Works, vol. i. p. 133; Oxford Edit. 8vo. 1827):—

'Hereby it appeared, that the gift of curing diseases without the help of art or nature was indeed a gift, and a gift of God, and so given by Him to His Apostles, that they could not exercise it arbitrarily, and at their own pleasure, but only to whom, when, where, and how God pleased, and should direct them to make use of that power; that so the glory of all the wonderful cures wrought by them might at last redound to God the author, and not to man the instrument.

'And (by the way) perhaps this is the best account that can be given of the relic and remainder of the primitive miraculous gift of healing, for some hundreds of years past, visible in this our nation, and annexed to the succession of our Christian kings: I mean the cure of that otherwise incurable disease called *morbus regius*, or the king's evil. That divers persons desperately labouring under it have been cured by the mere

'touch of the royal hand, assisted with the prayers of the
'priests of our Church attending, is unquestionable, unless the
'faith of all our ancient writers, and the consentient report of
'hundreds of most credible persons in our own age, attesting
'the same, be to be questioned. And yet, they say some of
'those diseased persons return from that sovereign remedy
'*re infectâ*, without any cure done upon them. How comes
'this to pass? God hath not given this gift of healing so abso-
'lutely to our royal line, but that He still keeps the reins of it
'in His own hand, to let them loose, or restrain them, as He
'pleaseth.'

These are instances in which people who admit the facts may still be at issue about the explanation of those facts.

But here, as usual, the author has been guilty of an enormous assumption. It is taken for granted that the question at issue is one of cause and not of fact in all cases, because it is so in certain cases. Let the number of miraculous cures of the cause of which there is a doubt, be as great as any one may claim them to be, there remain an immense number about which the whole issue rests on the *fact*. We need scarcely say that the cardinal miracle of the Resurrection is one of this kind. And the main argument of this Essay rests wholly upon this supposition, for in fact the attempts to discredit human testimony are nothing more than an exhibition of a desire on the part of the writer to pare off all such parts of a narrative as are inconsistent with the doctrine that a miracle is impossible, and to leave the remainder to fit in as best it may with the laws of nature, as already known or hereafter to be discovered.

Thus the author says (p. 107):—

'The question agitated is not that of mere testimony, of its
'value or of its failures. It refers to those *antecedent* considera-
'tions which must govern our entire view of the subject, and
'which, being dependent on higher laws of belief, must be para-
'mount to all attestation, or rather belong to a province distinct
'from it. What is alleged is a case of the supernatural; but no
'testimony can reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply
'only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an
'extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or pheno-
'menon; that it is due to supernatural causes, is entirely depen-
'dent on the previous belief and assumptions of the parties.'
Now we beg to call attention to this paragraph. It is one of those at first sight apparently reasonable passages with which this Essay abounds, but which, when examined closely, are based upon a mere fallacy. What contradiction is there, we ask, between the supernatural and sensible facts? The Resurrection was certainly both supernatural and a sensible fact. What the

author meant, we beg his pardon, we should say, what the author ought to have meant, was that testimony applies to facts and not to abstractions or laws; and then no one would have found fault with him for adding, that the natural or supernatural character of the transaction will have to be judged of by reason. We will add for ourselves, that persons who are persuaded of the Almighty's power to do what He wills with the creatures He has made, will be open to any evidence which will establish the miraculous nature of any given operation, whilst those who consider with Professor Powell, that nature works for herself, or that there are conclusive reasons for believing that her laws, as cognizable by us, cannot be interfered with by their Creator, will shut their eyes to any thing that seems to contravene this belief. But why the former class should be sneered at and stigmatized as bigots rather than the latter, we profess we are not logicians enough to understand.

Though it is intimated that the number of people who disbelieve miracles is great, and that the prevalent conviction is that miracles are not to be expected, and that alleged marvels are commonly discredited, yet the author admits, that there are still to be found persons who firmly believe in the occurrence of certain miracles in our own times. These are dismissed, with the summary explanation,—‘that we invariably find that this is only in connexion with their own particular tenets.’ Here is another assertion very wide of the truth. To notice other instances of this, there are many who have been convinced of miraculous powers possessed by St. Francis Xavier, who are far from adopting Roman views of religion. If the author means by ‘particular tenets’ the faith of Christianity, he would have been nearer the truth, but the expression would not have suited him so well; whilst the arguments of all who advocate miracles as credentials of Christianity, are set aside as the reasonings ‘of those who have failed to grasp the positive scientific idea of the power of the inductive philosophy or the *order of nature*.’

This positive scientific idea must, we think, be very hard to grasp, since, as far as we know, no Christian philosopher besides Professor Powell has yet attained to it. Neither does he explain to us how he has reached it, whether by revelation, or intuition, or deduction. If it is an inductive truth, and in no other way can the laws of matter be elicited, according to any ordinary laws of human nature, we humbly submit that it must be content to be tested by every occurrence that shall at any time hereafter be brought to bear against it. The very test of its truth will be its ability to bear being confronted with fact; and if any one shall say that the law of gravitation, the best established law of physics in the universe, shall never meet with any

fact which shall suggest a modification of it, or which shall distinctly interfere with it in the way of miraculous interposition, we say that such person is affirming more than he can prove. What will be discovered in the future we do not know; we have every reason to suppose from the analogy of the past, that the coming age will enlarge the generalizations of science as it exists at present. The boundaries of nature, says our Essayist, exists only where our *present* knowledge places them; the discoveries of to-morrow will alter and enlarge them. But who would have thought that any one pretending to the name of a philosopher would have committed himself to such a statement as the following:—‘The inevitable progress of research ‘must, within a longer or shorter period, unravel all that seems ‘most marvellous; and what is at present least understood will ‘become as familiarly known to the science of the future as those ‘points which a few centuries ago were involved in equal ‘obscurity, but are now thoroughly understood’?

We have no time for more; but we shall not make the want of time an excuse for not presenting our readers with a definitely elaborated theory of miracles. On the contrary, we believe that no such thing is possible. God has seen fit to exhibit his power in a mode in which, in by far the largest number of instances He has permitted man to trace somewhat of His purpose, and to investigate some way into the laws of cause and effect. In certain cases He has acted in such way as to controvert all the laws which we know, or can know, except by revelation; but He has not given the power to man of drawing a definite line which shall enable any one to decide upon those numerous cases which occupy the border land between the ordinary and the miraculous. It would indeed be unlike all other parts of the scheme of Revelation if the appeal of faith were made merely to the intellect, and the evidence on which conviction was to be framed, were independent of the moral character of him to whom the appeal was made.

ART. VIII.—*An Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology.*

By the Rev. ROBERT OWEN, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College,
Oxford. London: Masters.

THE originators of the *Edinburgh Review* first, we believe, introduced the practice of making a book serve as a mere peg, whereon to hang an article. The plan, though frequently found a source of convenience to the reviewer, is not always equally gratifying to the author of the book, which is thus employed. Mr. Owen's volume is one of those which deserves a more extended notice than the very brief one accorded in our last number, where it was, we must own, treated in the above-mentioned rather uncomplimentary fashion. We now propose to give some account of its contents, speaking freely as we proceed respecting its merits and defects, and reserving to ourselves the right to make a few general remarks (if we can find room for them) before we conclude.

By a sort of conventional understanding it is commonly assumed, that the examiner is necessarily superior in learning to the examinee, and the reviewer to the reviewed. At the very outset we willingly, in the present instance, disclaim any such assumption. Our learning, in the particular department of knowledge which is discussed in Mr. Owen's work, is most probably far inferior to his. Such a confession need not, however, imply either that our account of his volume must be incorrect; or that we may not legitimately prefer the explanations of certain terms and propositions contained in other books; or, thirdly, that we may not with justice and propriety call attention to certain considerations which he appears to have overlooked.

The book before us is a rather closely printed octavo, of nearly 500 pages, and is divided into thirty-one chapters. A valuable preface ably points out the difficulties of composing such a treatise, and names the leading volumes, Patristic, Scholastic, or subsequent to the Reformation, whence assistance may be derived. Among these, the writings of Anglican divines are the least often appealed to, on the very reasonable ground of the facility with which they may be consulted.

On the first three chapters, which are mainly occupied with Faith, Holy Scripture, and the authority of the Church, we shall say little more than that they are well written and may be

read with profit. • Exhaustive of course they do not pretend to be, for in that case the work would be a great deal more than an *Introduction* to this province of Theology. Among topics deserving of notice in these chapters may be mentioned—a remarkable admission of Cardinal Cajetan, respecting the inferior rank of the Apocrypha, which almost coincides with our own sixth article (p. 20); a brief extract from Origen *περὶ ἀρχῶν* which might have saved Professor Jowett from some recent (not very wise) assertions, in reference to that Father (p. 24); a beautiful passage from S. John Damascene, on the study of the Holy Scripture (pp. 26, 7); the limitation of the use of tradition laid down by S. Vincent of Lerins (pp. 34, 5); the remarks of the foreign Protestant Chamier on S. Mary as *semper Virgo* (pp. 44, 5); an able statement of Cardinal Panormitan, on the *representative* character of Councils; and some observations of the author himself, on the primary meaning of S. Matthew xviii. 17 (p. 31), on the well-known and strange statement of S. Irenæus about Millennial Bliss (p. 41), and on other topics which exhibit a really happy combination of independence of thought with true reverence. To relieve the dulness of such an enunciation as the above, we cite, at second-hand, from Mr. Owen, a portion of the passage of Damascene, to which reference has just been made.

“He that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.” Let us knock then at the most beautiful paradise of the Scriptures, the fragrant, the sweetest, the most comely, that resounds about our ears with all kinds of songs of intellectual God-inspired birds; that lays hold of our heart, soothing it when in pain, calming it when stirred by passion, and filling it with everlasting joy; that setteth our understanding on the golden and brilliant back of the Divine Dove, and on its brightest wings leadeth us up to the Only-Begotten Son and heir of the planter of the everlasting vineyard, and through Him bringeth us near to the Father of Lights. But let us not knock idly, but rather earnestly and continuously. Let us not faint in knocking, for so shall it be opened to us. If we read once and again, and do not quite perceive what we read, let us not faint but tarry; let us converse, let us ask; for, “ask thy father,” it says, “and he shall declare it unto thee, thy elders, and they shall tell thee,” for knowledge belongeth not to all. Let us draw out of the well of this paradise, overflowing and purest waters springing up to life eternal. Let us luxuriate in them insatiably, let us take our fill, for they possess grace free of cost. And if we can derive any profit also from what is beside them, it is not forbidden. Let us become approved money-changers, laying up the genuine and pure gold, but rejecting the counterfeit.’

The chapter on the Existence and Attributes of God, is (for the size of the work) long and interesting. Yet it strikes us as being less complete than many other portions of the volume. Mr. Owen might, we think, have consulted with advantage Dr. Clarke’s ‘Boyle Lectures,’ on the same subject; a volume of such merit, that even Dr. Newman, if we are not mistaken, recom-

mended it to the Roman Catholic pupils under his authority during his sojourn in Dublin. Clarke sums up the Divine Attributes as ultimately referrible to these three leading ones, Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Perfect Goodness. Nor is it easy to conceive any attribute of the Almighty, which may not in some sense be considered as falling under one of these three. But Mr. Owen, while treating of those Attributes which may be classed under Perfect Power, and Perfect Knowledge, has, most unaccountably, neglected to speak, in this place, of God's Justice, Truth, and other Moral Perfections. Yet surely Clarke is justified in asserting that these last-named Perfections must, *of necessity*, belong to the Supreme Cause and Author of all things quite as much as the Perfection of Might or of Wisdom. *Bonitas* occupies a conspicuous place in the first part of the *Summa* of Aquinas (Qu. VI.), who lays it down *quod bonum esse Deo præcipue convenit*; and is handled in like manner by Bishop Pearson in his *Lectures de Deo et Attributis*. Among the principles enforced by Pearson are these following; *Deum esse bonum bonitate absolutâ*; *Deum esse ἡρεπάρηθον*; *Deum adeo bonum esse, ut causa sit omnis bonitatis creatæ*.¹

We do not, of course, mean to imply that Mr. Owen would for a moment hesitate in admitting the truth of these and other cognate propositions, which at once commend themselves to the acceptance of every devout Christian. But their absence is to be remarked upon, because they are most intimately connected with the attribute of Omnipotence, which, at the first glance, they almost seem to limit. For if the absolute Goodness of God prevents him from altering, or dispensing with, the Moral Law,—and Aquinas, Hooker, Butler, Clarke, Cudworth, Suarez, all proclaim His inability to alter or dispense with it—how can He be, in strictness, said to be *Almighty*? These divines, with many more, reply, that such limitation does by no means interfere with the Omnipotence of God, inasmuch as His Goodness, like each of His other attributes, is identical with Himself, and the law which He ever obeys is a law that is self-imposed. His own Perfections alone limit Him. 'God cannot lie;' because He is the absolute and perfect Truth. These considerations tend, moreover, to show the close and indissoluble connexion that exists between *Dogmatic* and *Moral* Theology; and hence arises another source of interest.

However, we must not permit our sense of an omission to obscure our perception of what this chapter really contains. It is only justice to say, that it imparts much solid information, which will not, so far as our experience reaches, be readily

¹ Minor Works. Ed. Churton, vol. i. pp. 67—72.

discovered in any other English book. We may instance the explanation of the difference between the Incommunicable and Communicable Attributes of the Creator. Under the former class are ranked His Simplicity, Unity, Immutability, Eternity, and Omnipresence. These, it is evident, cannot be bestowed upon the creature. The immortality of the soul is not only unlike that of its Maker in being imparted, but likewise in that it looks forward only, not backward. To the Almighty, and to Him alone, belongs, in scholastic phrase, *Æternitas à parte post et ante*; to us only the *Æternitas à parte post*. Hence, perhaps (as we once heard a distinguished living divine remark) the extreme difficulty felt by the mind in even *conceiving* the idea of eternity in the past, an eternity that has had no beginning. We can much more easily bring home to ourselves the idea of eternity in the future. Indeed, the difficulty here lies on the side of all attempts to shake it off; as unbelievers have often sadly experienced. For to that eternity we were destined from our birth; whether an eternity of weal or woe lies in our own power. *εἰς δ' ἐπὶ νίκαν, δι' Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

But there are other attributes which (in a measure) God can impart, and does impart, to his creatures. Such for example are life and wisdom. That it is possible for a created nature to partake very largely of these gifts, is shown by the way in which they have been communicated to the humanity of the Incarnate Son. 'For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, *because He is the Son of Man*. . . . In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.'¹

Among the many merits of Mr. Owen's volume must be reckoned the explanation of terms, which though of frequent occurrence, are by no means commonly understood. In the chapter now under consideration, he takes the opportunity of explaining the useful distinction of Peter Lombard respecting the *Voluntas beneplaciti* and the *Voluntas signi*; the former being the secret, the latter the revealed Will of God. Our author, however, refrains from committing himself to all that the Master of the Sentences alleges on this point: but cites happily, by way of illustrating the actual existence of such a distinction, the words of Moses in the book of Deuteronomy (xxix. 29), 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but the things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever.'²

¹ S. John v. 26, 27; Col. ii. 3.

² Mr. Owen says (p. 104) with reference to Peter Lombard, that 'to introduce anything like contradiction or change into God's Will, would be to run counter

Of the chapter on the Holy Trinity we have only to speak in terms of commendation. The *περιχώρησις* (in Latin *Circumin-cessio*), is well explained as 'the existence and presence of the Persons in one another by reason of their identity of nature and essence;' and is finely illustrated by the following words of S. John Damascene:—

'We cannot speak of local distance in the case of the uncircumscribed Godhead, as we can in our own; for the persons are in each other, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere, according to the word of the Lord, who said, "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me." Now, can we speak of difference of will, or of judgment, or of operation, or of power, or of aught else, which things beget in us the practical and complete distinction. Wherefore also we do not say that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are three Gods, but rather One God, the Holy Trinity; the Son and Spirit being referred to One Cause, not composed nor commingled, according to the comprehension of Sabellius (*συναίρεσις*); for they are united, as we said, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere in one another. And they have their *circumin-cession* in one another without any commixture or confusion; neither emanating or essentially sundered, according to Arius's division (*διαίρεσις*); for the Godhead is inseparable in separate (persons), and as in three suns close to one another and that are inseparable, the blending and cohesion of light is one.'—Pp. 123-4. [*S. Jo. Damasc., De Orthod. Fide, cap. 8.*]

We observe that Mr. Owen just touches upon the deep, and probably insoluble, question, why the Holy Spirit is not a Son; or, in other words, how Divine procession may be held to differ from Divine generation. Without denying the lawfulness of reverent speculation upon such a subject, we see no reason to alter an opinion expressed in this Review some six years since; namely, that the confession which S. Augustin makes of his ignorance in this matter, is more satisfactory than the attempted explanation of Aquinas.¹

From the sixth chapter of this volume, treating of the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, we have much pleasure in quoting the following words, which proceed from the author's own pen. [We are responsible for the italics.]

'It was the usual practice of the early Christian writers, in introducing the doctrines of the faith to the consideration of the heathen philosophers, to blend the Revelation of the Second person of the Trinity with the received theories concerning the archetypal Reason or Intellect, which framed the visible universe, and emanated directly from the mysterious and hidden First Cause of all things. It may be that they erred on the side of indiscreet zeal: that in their anxiety to smooth the way for the acceptance of Christianity by many

'to His attribute of Immutability.' We much doubt whether the venerable Schoolman would have allowed that his assertions *did* involve any change of the Divine Will. He merely says that God has at times ordered what he did not really will, '*præcepit enim Abrahæ immolare filium, nec tamen voluit, nec ideo præcepit ut id fieret, sed ut Abrahæ probaretur fides.*' (Lib. i. Dist. xlv.)

¹ Some remarks of Aquinas are cited by Mr. Owen, p. 121. For S. Augustin, see cont. Maximinum ii. 14, or *Christian Remembrancer* for July, 1855, p. 123.

who came as near to the Truth as unaided human reason would allow, they mixed up too much of the earthly element with the heavenly, and laid the foundation for future heresies. *But it is not for us who have entered on the inheritance of the faith without preconceived ideas to be removed, or difficulties to be harmonized, whose belief too often amounts to nothing better than an indolent uninterested assent to propositions recommended by custom or authority; it is not for us to blame them lightly, or to affect the supercilious brow of an immaculate and superior criticism.* Be it ours to accept the results of their stammering efforts and acquiesce in the decisions of the Catholic Church. It was necessary to assume some starting point in opening the ground which issued in the rich harvest of the Gentiles, and the fresh turn which the fathers gave to the Platonic disquisitions respecting the Logos or Divine Reason, was as legitimate as S. Paul's developing the incident of the Athenian inscription "to the Unknown God," into a declaration of Him whom they ignorantly worshipped. The Jewish belief in the coming Messiah, however alloyed with dreams of His temporal splendour, and invariably falling far short of the pure spiritual type of the reality, still formed the basis whence Apostolic missionaries might win souls to the obedience of the faith. And the purest Greek philosophy was, as it were, a thinner and clearer atmosphere through which the light of the Gospel might shine forth serenely.'

Our limits compel us to pass by two interesting chapters upon the Holy Angels, and the Fallen ones. These chapters supply valuable information respecting the famous book, once attributed to S. Dionysius the Areopagite, the convert of S. Paul. The following remarks, which Mr. Owen translates from Origen, are very sound and practical :

'For as in some things, the human purpose alone by itself is imperfect towards the consummation of good, for by the Divine aid is everything brought to perfection : so also in contrary things we receive certain beginnings, and as it were some seeds of sins from those things which we have naturally in use. But when we have indulged more than enough, and have not made a stand against the first motions of intemperance, then the hostile influence taking the place of this first transgression, instigates and over-urges us, by all means studying to enlarge sins more profusely ; we men, indeed, supplying the occasions and beginnings of sins, but the adverse powers propagating them more widely and further, it may be, without any end. We are not, however, to suppose that aught else befalls us from the good or evil thoughts themselves which are suggested to our hearts, except a commotion only and incitement provoking us to good or to evil. For, when the malignant influence begins to incite us to evil, it is possible for us to cast away from us bad suggestions, and resist the worst persuasions, and altogether do nothing blameable. Therefore is it written, "Keep thy heart with all diligence ; for out of it are the issues of life," and "Be ye angry and sin not : neither give place to the devil," "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices.'

In the chapter which follows (that, namely on the 'Creation and Government of the World,') Mr. Owen has hardly, we think, done justice to the Patristic evidence in favour of supposing the Mosaic days to be lengthened periods. We mentioned in our last number, the remarkable circumstance, that such an interpretation had occurred to the minds of Saints and Doctors, such as Athanasius, Augustin, Anselm, Origen, and others ;

and gave a few extracts¹ and references, none of which appear in the volume before us. Now this is not an unimportant matter; for it is a common device of rationalistic writers of our time, sometimes despite their knowledge, but more often in sheer ignorance, to maintain that such interpretations of the first chapter of Genesis simply date from the time of geological discoveries, and were invented as a mere subterfuge from the pressure of an acknowledged difficulty. A statement of this nature is evidently implied, in a recent account of the teaching of 'Essays and Reviews,' by a French layman of somewhat rationalistic bias, M. Edmond Scherer.²

On the origin of Evil, our author, in the main, adopts what is perhaps the safest line, and the one which probably counts in its favour a majority of orthodox theologians; viz. to confess that it is an inscrutable mystery, and there leave it. We say *in the main*, because he does mention a few theories concerning it on the just and reasonable ground that, 'although it is hopeless to attempt an investigation of so primary a mystery, it is not useless to cast about for reasons to calm the human intellect, and to persuade it to acquiesce in the ignorance which its Maker has thought right to impose.' (P. 213). We have here, incidentally through S. John Damascene, the important distinction between what God permits, and what He actually operates. It may be remarked in passing, that the non-recognition of this distinction in Mohammedan theology is the fruitful source of great confusion of thought, and of miserable, however unintentional, distortion of the representation of the Divine character and attributes.

The treatment of the 'Creation of Man,' gives occasion for a clear and forcible statement of the arguments against the pre-existence of souls. The curious, further question, whether souls are formed by separate *de-cisions* from the parent soul breathed into Adam, or are newly created for each body, is temperately discussed. These opposing views are, as is well known, termed respectively by the schoolmen, Traducianism and Creatianism. Our own opinion is, that Creatianism appears to have in its favour, the greater weight of argument and authority. But we are not convinced that Aquinas proves his right to stigmatize Traducianism as *heretical*, even when it is applied to the production of the intellectual *anima*; nor should we have cited his

¹ Art. Dogma in relation to 'Essays and Reviews,' pp. 465—6.

² *Revue des deux Mondes*, for 15th May, 1861. The *Edinburgh Review* for last April, represents the criticism of 'Essays and Reviews' in the *Westminster Review* for October, 1860, as hopelessly false and unfair. It is curious to see how similar is the impression made by the volume on the cool, unbiassed understanding of M. Scherer to that of the writer in the *Westminster*.

language on this subject, as is done by Mr. Owen, without some degree of reservation.

The twelfth chapter introduces a question, of which the proper investigation would demand a far greater space than we can at present afford. It is this; what is the amount of patristic evidence in favour of the lawfulness of a purely figurative interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis? We say a *purely* figurative interpretation; for it is a great mistake to suppose that when the Fathers talk of a figurative sense, they necessarily mean to deny the substratum of fact.

We quit Mr. Owen's book for a moment, to illustrate this point. In a recent pamphlet by a clergyman of note, who was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1853, we find the following assertions:

'S. Augustin thought that it was preposterous to assert that the beginning of Genesis might not be interpreted figuratively. . . . S. Augustin held that all the account of creation might be figurative, and that "*nullus Christianus dicere audebit, non esse accipienda figuratiter.*"'—*Address on Orthodoxy and Rationalism*, by Rev. B. M. Cowie, pp. 12, 21.¹

Now not only does Mr. Cowie give us a reference to his author, *De Genesi ad Literam*, I. 1, but he translates, with perfect correctness, ten or eleven lines. The conclusion of his translated extract runs as follows. 'For no Christian will dare to say that they are not to be taken figuratively, when he gives heed to the Apostle saying, "All these things happened unto them in a figure," (1 Cor. x. 2), and reminding us that the record in Genesis, "And they two shall be one flesh," is a great Sacrament, referring to God and the Church.'

Now to us it seems that Augustin here raises a question which he does not completely answer. He begins with a reference to the possibility of a purely figurative meaning (*figuratum tantummodo intellectum*). He proceeds to prove that certain texts are to be accepted figuratively, but the word *only* does not re-appear. Is it to be conceived that the Bishop of Hippo understood S. Paul to signify, that because the events of Jewish history bear a typical meaning they did not actually happen, or that the matrimony of our first parents was the less a reality because it typified the infinitely sublimer union of Christ with His Church?

We cannot think that any careful student of S. Augustin will acquiesce in such a conclusion. In his work against Faustus, the Manichæan (lib. xxii. cap. 24), S. Augustin writes: 'I say that not merely the tongue, but even the life of these men was prophetic, and that the entire rule of the Hebrews was

¹ London. Bell and Daldy, 1861.

'one mighty prophet, because [the prophet] of a certain Mighty One. "For all those things," as the Apostle says, "were our types (*figuræ nostræ*)."'

And if this be not sufficient to show the sentiments of the writer, let us turn to the *De Civitate Dei* (Lib. xiii. Cap. 21). Hence some refer the whole of that Paradise, where the first parents of the human race are recorded to have been in the truth of Holy Scripture, to objects of thought (*intelligibilia*), and turn those trees and fruit-bearing shrubs into the virtues and morals of life; as if they were not visible and material, but said or written in that style with a view to the signification of objects of thought. As if Paradise could not be a material one (*corporalis*) because it may likewise be regarded in a spiritual point of view (*quia potest etiam spiritalis intelligi*); as if there were not two women, Agar and Sarah, and from them two sons of Abraham, one from the bond-maid, one from the free woman, because the Apostle says that two Testaments were prefigured in them, or as if water had not flowed from a rock at the stroke of Moses, because in a figurative signification Christ may therein also be perceived, since the same Apostle says, "for that rock was Christ." Augustin proceeds to mention various possible interpretations (as e.g. that the four rivers have been taken to represent the four cardinal virtues; or again the four Holy Gospels) and then adds, 'If these and any other things may be more suitably said on the spiritual sense of Paradise, let them be said without hindrance from any man; provided, however, that the truth of that history be believed, as commended to us by a most faithful narrative of events.' It may, however, be thought by some, that S. Augustin had changed his mind, and that it is unfair to answer a question proposed in one of his treatises by an extract taken from another. This doubt is easily set at rest. In the first chapter of the eighth book of this very same treatise, *De Genesi ad Literam*, we read as follows: 'I am not ignorant that many have said much on the subject of Paradise. There are, however, so to speak, three usual opinions on this matter. One, of those who would have Paradise understood only in a material sense. Another, of those who take it only in a spiritual sense. A third, of those who understand Paradise in each sense, at one time materially, but at another spiritually (*aliàs corporaliter, aliàs autem spiritaliter*). To speak briefly, I confess that I like this third opinion. . . . The narrative, then, in these books is not to be classed with discourses concerning things figurative, as in the Song of Songs, but of thorough facts (*omnino gestarum*) as in the Books of Kings, and the like.'

Mr. Cowie should surely have looked more closely into this

matter before he twice declared to the Fellows of Sion College, that S. Augustin 'held that all the account of creation might be figurative.'

We return to Mr. Owen. He quotes on this head the well-known words of Aquinas. 'Those things which are said in Scripture of Paradise are set forth by manner of historical narrative. But in all things which Scripture so delivers, the truth of history is to be held for a foundation, and spiritual expositions are to be framed thereupon (*est pro fundamento tenenda veritas historię: et desuper spirituales expositiones fabricandę*).'¹ The following from Damascene, is, however, new to us.

'Some then, have imagined Paradise one of sense, others of intellect. But it seems to me, that, as man was created sensitive at the same time and intellectual, so also his most sacred home was at the same time sensitive and intellectual, and one that possessed a double expression. For in the body man dwelt in the divinest and most beautiful spot; but in the soul he abode in a higher and incomparable and far more beautiful place, having as his home God indwelling in him, having Him a glorious covering, and being endued with His grace; and, as another angel, feasting on the alone sweetest fruit of His contemplation, and being fed thereby.'

Without at all wishing to pre-judge the case, we may remark that it seems a fair question whether *some* of the authors who have employed S. Augustin's language may not have meant, as he did, to imply the existence of a literal sense beneath the allegorical.

We now pass over several chapters (which meet, however, with our cordial approbation) and arrive at the eighteenth, which treats of Predestination. On this question Mr. Owen inclines towards Augustinianism to a degree that somewhat surprises us. Can we ask the reader's attention for a short time while we try to explain our position, and the grounds of our differences from Churchmen who think with Mr. Owen?

We begin, then, thus. The greatest theologians of our time (and there is no substantial difference on this point between England and Rome) hold and teach the existence of two co-ordinate truths; viz. God's over-ruling Sovereignty, man's free agency. How these two truths can be reconciled they are almost content to leave, without even an attempt at solution. Nor does philosophy seem to speak differently from theology. Sir William Hamilton, in his 'Discussions,' arrives at the same conclusion as has here been enunciated, and confirms his statements by extracts from the works of accredited divines.

It would be quite consistent with such tenets as these to hold the lawfulness, and even the duty, of enforcing one or the other

¹ Sum. Theol. Pars I. Qu. CIL. Art. I.

of these truths the more strongly, with a special reference to times and circumstances. On any person, or set of persons, who should be inclined to trust too exclusively to what had been wrought and is being wrought for them, it may be requisite to press the need of man's co-operation, to say in the words of the Apostle, 'Work out your own salvation,' though it be 'with fear and trembling.' On those who might be in danger of undue reliance in their own strength, it may be needful to urge more forcibly the conclusion of the text, 'For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.'

Those, however, who would fain, under all circumstances, press the Augustinian views of the Divine predestination might probably argue somewhat as follows. Here is a view taught by one who is confessedly the greatest Doctor of the West. It is in the main, though with some modification, the teaching of Aquinas and of many leading schoolmen. In the English Church it is deeply impressed upon her articles and homilies. On the Continent, not only did it exercise immense influence over Protestant Reformers, but it was likewise the cardinal principle of a movement which has many peculiar claims upon our sympathy. Fragrance still breathes from the vanished walls of Port Royal: such names as those of De Sacy, of the *Mère Angélique*, of Anne Geneviève de Longueville, are cherished with affectionate remembrance by even French *littérateurs*, such as M. Victor Cousin, and by many Englishmen, such as Sir James Stephen, Isaac Taylor, Mr. Beard, and others. Above all, the works of Pascal must be considered as a part of the common literature of Christendom.

All this we admit. Nevertheless it sounds to us like a collection of half-truths. Let us comment on the case in a reverse order, and begin with the Port-Royalists. However admirable may have been their work against the false and dangerous casuistry of the Jesuits, it does not therefore follow that their own maxims upon the doctrine of grace were entirely sound. Those who would lay stress upon splendid names must not forget such Jesuit ones as Francis Xavier, Francis Borgia, or the learned commentator Cornelius à Lapide. Bossuet is not a person whose judgment can be treated lightly, and Bossuet seems to have been inclined to defend that great bugbear of Jansenism, the treatise of Molina, *De liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis concordia*. In truth, these two great parties have always seemed to us to be strong in the attack. Jansenism successfully attacked the Jesuit casuistry. Jesuitism in turn was by no means wholly unsuccessful in its onslaught upon Jansenist views of grace.¹

¹ The following extract from the letters of a fervent Jansenist lady, Madame de Sevigné, may give some idea of the tone of lay supporters of the cause:—

Then, again, though it be true that the Articles and Homilies of the English Church put prominently forward the Augustinian side of these profound and difficult questions, it must not be forgotten that the other side, that of man's free agency, is to the full as prominent in the Prayer-book, and strongly implied in the sacramental and quasi-sacramental services. Moreover to the general argument deducible from our formularies, from the schoolmen, and from the fathers, there is room, if we are not mistaken, for the following general reply.

Neither particular phrases, nor particular tenets can ever hold precisely the same place in theology, when once it has been discovered by experience that they are liable to any serious abuse. It is not always enough to say *abusus non tollit usum*; if it can be shown that there is constantly exhibited in the particular case in hand a fatal facility in the progress from the one to the other. Many a phrase employed innocently and unsuspectingly before the rise of Eutychianism or Pelagianism was dropped, so soon as the Church perceived the dangerous sense of which it was capable. In like manner, the teaching of S. Augustin on predestination, though (up to a certain point) most valuable and necessary as a protest against every form of Pelagianism, cannot, we humbly submit, be regarded in exactly the same light as before, since the rise of that system of religion which bears the name of the Genevese reformer. Calvinism has shown what *may be* made of the Augustinian tenets on the Divine sovereignty; how they may tend, if unbalanced, to the overthrow of all sacramental doctrine; how perilous they *may* become to all true conceptions of the Divine attributes; how frequently they have been found to merge into Arianism and

'Is it not God who gives us the object and desire of belonging to Him? It is that which is crowned; it is God who crowns His gifts; if that is what you mean by *free will*, ah! I fully admit it. Jesus Christ has Himself said; "I know my sheep; I will lead them forth Myself, I will lose none of them. . . . I have chosen you, ye have not chosen me." I find a thousand passages of this character; I listen to them all; and when I read the contrary, I say: *it is because they wished to speak popularly* (communément); it is as when we say, God hath repented Himself; that He is angry, etc.; it is because they speak to men. I hold to this first and great truth, which is all Divine.' We can hardly wonder that De Maistre should lay hold of such writing as this, as he does in his '*L'Eglise Gallicane*,' where he argues that we might just as well lay hold of all texts that speak of God's pardon of sins, and declare that those which tell of His punishment of sin, of the unpardonable sin, etc., must be modified and explained away by these former ones. In an earlier paragraph of this same letter, or a similar one, Madame de Sevigné avows that 'there is no Justice except His will.' Now place this proposition before Hooker, Butler, and Clarke: they would all condemn it as unreservedly as the Jesuits. They would all say, 'God wills this or that, because it is just:' not 'this and that is just because He wills it.' They would all condemn the paradox of Ockham, 'that God could make it our duty to hate Him.' It is worth noticing that Dr. Johnson thought the Jesuits had the better case in these points.

Socinianism; how they have endangered the faith of numbers by presenting religion in so terrific a form, so devoid of all consolation, in short so utterly one-sided, as to create a deep-seated despair, and too often actual insanity.

Is this language too strong? We think not. Let us cull a few words descriptive of this teaching from one who has been in a measure nurtured in its traditions, and who does the fullest justice to the loftiness, the sincerity, the earnest devotedness of the teachers themselves.

'Dr. Hopkins in many places distinctly recognises the fact, that the greater part of the human race, up to this time, had been eternally lost, and boldly assumes the ground, that this amount of sin and suffering, being the best and most necessary means of the greatest amount of final happiness, was not merely permitted, but distinctly chosen, decreed, and provided for, as essential in the schemes of Infinite Benevolence. He held that this decree not only *permitted* each individual act of sin, but also took measures to make it certain, though, by an exercise of infinite skill, it accomplished this result without violating human free agency. . . . The sermons preached by President Edwards on this subject are so terrific in their refined poetry of torture, that very few persons of quick sensibility could read them through without agony; and it is related that when in those calm and tender tones which never rose to passionate enunciation, he read these discourses, the house was often filled with shrieks and wailings, and that a brother minister once laid hold of his skirts, exclaiming in an involuntary agony, "Oh, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Edwards, is God not a God of mercy?"

'Not that these men were indifferent or insensible to the dread words they spoke; their whole lives and deportment bore thrilling witness to their sincerity. Edwards set apart special days of fasting, in view of the dreadful doom of the lost, in which he was wont to walk the floor, weeping and wringing his hands. Hopkins fasted every Saturday. David Brainerd gave up every refinement of civilized life to weep and pray at the feet of hardened savages, if by any means he might save *one*. All, by lives of eminent purity and earnestness, gave awful weight and sanction to their words. . . . But it is to be conceded that these systems, so admirable in relation to the energy, earnestness, and acuteness of their authors, when received as absolute truth, and as a basis of actual life, had on minds of a certain class, the effect of a slow poison, producing life habits of morbid action very different from any which ever followed the simple reading of the Bible. . . . In no other place or time of Christendom have so fearful issues been presented to the mind. Some Church interposed its protecting shield; the Christian-born and baptized child was supposed in some wise rescued from the curse of the fall, and related to the great redemption—to be a member of Christ's family, and, if ever so sinful, still enfolded in some vague sphere of hope and protection. Augustin solaced the dread anxieties of trembling love by prayers offered for the dead, in times when the Church above and on earth presented itself to the eye of the mourner as a great assembly with one accord lifting interceding hands for the parted soul.

But the clear logic and intense individualism of New England, deepened the problems of the Augustinian faith, while they swept away all those softening provisions so earnestly clasped to the throbbing heart of that great poet of theology. No rite, no form, no paternal relation, no faith or prayer of Church earthly or heavenly, interposed the slightest shield between the trembling spirit and

Eternal Justice. The individual entered eternity alone, as if he had no interceding relation in the universe.¹

Although this sketch proceeds from the pen of a lady, and is introduced in the course of a tale, we see no reason to doubt its perfect correctness in the main. But if even in the hands of such sincere men this teaching had 'on minds of a certain class the effects of a slow poison,' what would it become when taught by men of less lofty principle? It would, almost inevitably, lead to a most grievous hypocrisy. Mrs. Stowe does not point this out; but another writer of the same land, Nathaniel Hawthorne, seems to have felt it deeply. We believe that the intense (we really trust excessive and undue) conviction of a vast amount of hypocrisy which is conspicuous in the 'Scarlet Letter' and in 'Mosses from an Old Manse,' arises from the circumstance that the author was brought up amidst these same Calvinistic traditions. Is there a land where Calvinism is rampant, that does not, proportionally, and side by side with earnestness, witness a vast development of hypocrisy?

Now Mr. Owen takes by far the greater part of his chapter on predestination, and *the whole* of his chapter on election straight out of the works of S. Augustin. Even if our objections to the Augustinian view appeared in the fifth century or before the Reformation, we maintain that some even among his contemporaries were dissatisfied. 'Cassian and 'other leading Churchmen at Marseilles, and throughout the 'south of Gaul,—including Hilary, who had recently been 'appointed to the primatial see of Arles, and was eminent for 'devotion, pastoral zeal, and theological ability—took serious 'exceptions to Augustin's predestinarian rigour. . . . Cassian 'and his friends admitted original sin and real grace. But they 'did not admit an absolute predestination of a fixed number of 'persons, not based on foresight of their perseverance; but 'making perseverance certain for them, and impossible for all 'beside. They denounced this teaching on moral grounds, as 'fatalistic in its tendencies, inciting to carelessness, and discouraging exertion. They insisted on God's offers of mercy 'to all men; on the universality of baptism; on the unlimited 'efficacy of the death of Christ.'² It is admitted in the valuable work from which we take these words, that *some* were led through their zeal for man's responsibility to take up untenable ground, and thus lapse into Semi-Pelagianism. But this error on the part of *some* does not militate against the im-

¹ The Minister's Wooing.

² Bright's History of The Church, A.D. 313—451 (p. 308).

portance and value of the general protest. 'Augustine, by his own showing, did not acknowledge, on man's part, a real freedom of will; on God's, a real readiness to have mercy upon all men. The truths for which the Gallicans were solicitous appeared in their due place, clear of all semi-Pelagian error, in the admirable dogmatic statements of a Gallican council held a century later, in 529, at Orange. That assembly scanned the mystery of grace and free-will on both sides; and while glorifying God as the inspirer of all prayer and faith, proclaimed that all the baptized, having received grace through baptism, could, by the co-operating aid of Christ, work out their own salvation.'¹ It is only fair to add that many of the canons of this council were sentences taken out of the works of S. Augustin and S. Prosper.

We have only room for a slight discussion of the remaining chapters of the work before us, and shall accordingly select, as most interesting, the topics of the Holy Eucharist and the Communion of Saints.

On the presence of our Lord in His own chief Sacrament, our author speaks much as Mr. Palmer in his 'Treatise on the Church.' 'It is a duty of common candour,' writes Mr. Owen, 'to exhibit the uniform and unwavering testimony borne by antiquity to the real and objective presence of Christ in the eucharist, under the forms or species of bread and wine.' (P. 414.) Any points of difference which may exist between us and our author on this head would probably be found to be of a purely metaphysical, or, perhaps, even merely verbal character. We pass on, therefore, to the question of the Sacrifice.

And here we cannot help regretting that Mr. Owen has not brought out more strongly what seems to us the immense difference between the argument on behalf of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and that for the Invocation of Saints; namely, that the former has a scriptural basis and the latter has not. Let us suppose a preacher or commentator, who pays any respect to the voice of the early Church, to be explaining the meaning of Malachi i. 11. Thomas Scott passes it quietly *sub silentio*; but then he did not pretend to echo the teaching of the Fathers. As, however, no question can be more natural and proper than this, 'Has this prophecy been fulfilled, or not?' we turn for satisfaction to some work from which we can obtain a reply. We take down, let us say, a volume of the learned Joseph Mede, and read as follows:—

¹ Bright, *ubi supra*.

'This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest time of the Church, a text of eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers, as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His name; and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learnt thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles.

'For in the age immediately succeeding them, it being the second hundred of years after Christ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the pillars of the age; the former of them flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of St. John; and the latter, a disciple of Polycarp, St. John's scholar. In the age following, or third *seculum*, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian: in the fourth *seculum* by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierom, and Augustine: and in the after ages, by whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as a singular opinion or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church; whence in some Liturgies (as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St. Mark) it is inserted into the Hymn or Preface, which begins 'Αληθῶς ἀξιόν ἐστι ἐκαὶ δίκαιον—"It is truly meet and right;" the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being, "Giving thanks we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this "reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations from the rising of "the sun to the going down of the same offer unto Thee; for Thy Name shall "be great among all nations; and in every place incense is offered unto Thy "Holy Name, and sacrifice and oblation."

Or again, let us suppose our expositor to dwell upon the language of S. Paul, in 1 Corinthians x. 16—21. What means this sudden transition from the Eucharist to the sacrifices of the law, and to the sacrifices of the heathen? As in the case of the former text, popular expositors pass it by. But to those who look closely into the matter, we can conceive no satisfactory explanation, excepting that the transition is perfectly natural, for this simple reason: that the Holy Eucharist *is* the Christian sacrifice, and may therefore properly admit, in this respect, of a comparison with the sacrificial rites of both Judaism and Paganism.

There are many passages of Holy Writ, as for example the accounts of the Institution, which point in the same direction. But, for the Invocation of departed Saints, what possible Scripture can be found? All the ingenuity of Estius can only discover one; and that one can hardly, we imagine, be thought capable of bearing any serious examination. It is the cry of the rich man, being in torments, to Abraham (S. Luke xvi. 24). Surely this mysterious narrative establishes nothing with respect to the duties of the living; to say nothing of the fact, that such an argument, if pressed home, would prove too much, as it would tend to make for invocation on the part of the lost. Nor do we believe that it is possible to adduce any primitive authority whatever on behalf of such an interpretation. How different from the evidence just cited from Mede upon the passage in Malachi.

We are not, be it observed, assuming that Mr. Owen would have any serious difference with us upon this score. All that we assert is, that the distinction, though implied in some of the general principles laid down at the outset of this book, is not here carried out in detail.

The intercession of departed Saints for us stands upon different ground. Not only is the miserable doctrine of the sleep of the soul anti-Scriptural and condemned by all primitive authority, but the remarkable language of S. John (Apoc. vi. 9—11) seems clearly to intimate that they pray for us. 'If,' writes Bishop Pearson, 'if we cut off all intercession of angels and saints for us living on earth, and striving with the host of evil spirits—if we acknowledge no power at all before the throne of God, of the martyrs who poured forth their lives for Christ,—if all those who venerated their remains are by us rejected, scouted, and branded as idolaters, . . . what that Church may be with which we can hold communion, I am altogether ignorant.'¹

We must here close our survey of Mr. Owen's pages. The work has, we imagine, made less impression than its real merits deserve. We say not this as if we were blind to some defects. These have been pointed out in our remarks on our author's treatment of such subjects as the Divine attributes, and predestination. We must add, that, though the passages for translation are well chosen and well rendered, there is room for criticism of Mr. Owen's style, when he is communicating his own thoughts. The extract, for example, which we have given from his sixth chapter, admirable as it is in tone, is certainly open to some objection in point of expression.

But it is not from its defects that this volume lies comparatively unheeded. Its learning, its honesty and fairness, its stores of information, ought to be more than sufficient to counter-balance these. It is neglected, because its subject-matter is not in fashion.

We cannot afford to re-write all our reasons against such neglect, nor again to fortify those reasons by the support given on the one hand by such writers as Professor Ellicott, on the other by Mr. Buckle and the Westminster Reviewers. Enough for the present to regret an error which, if often rebuked by unexpected allies, is often on the other hand fostered by unlooked-for opponents.

¹ Minor Works, Ed. Churton, Vol. II. pp. 54, 55. The translation is by the late Dr. Mill, 'Sermons on the Nature of Christianity,' p. 52. We rather quote the passage, because Mr. Owen writes as if he were not aware of its existence, and gives an extract, much less to the point, from the Bishop's work on the Creed.

Thus, for instance, we have heard it said by able men, and seen it in print from able pens, that to admit theology to be a science, implies the possibility of some utter change passing over it. Those who speak thus are, we suspect, thinking of inductive sciences alone. But the triumphs of physical philosophy must not induce us to forget that there are such things as deductive sciences likewise. Differing as we do *toto cælo* from Mr. Buckle (who preaches mere theism and disbelieves in revelation), we perfectly agree with him in classing theology with the deductive sciences. Now, in such sciences it is perfectly possible that enlargement of their range should prove compatible with the existence of unshaken foundations. Thus, in mathematics (which are generally allowed to be the best type of a deductive science) the marvellous powers of analysis conferred by the invention of the differential calculus do not render Euclid's 'Elements of Geometry' untrue. In like manner, not all that criticism, history, philology, and metaphysics can accomplish towards the elucidation of divine truth, has yet been found really to militate against the doctrines enshrined in the creeds; and we venture to affirm that it never will.

But we turn to a more individualised attack upon dogmatic theology. The Professor of Modern History at Oxford has entered upon a course of argument against positivism. We rejoice at this; for not only would it be difficult to find an abler opponent of this pernicious phase of thought, but the same arguments coming from a layman, and one known to be what is called a liberal, will be listened to with far more willingness and produce a much greater effect than they possibly could if they were enunciated in publications such as the reader has now before him. But honesty is a primary duty, and it would not be honest for us to accept the aid, even of one for whose character and abilities we have such sincere respect, if in so doing we were supposed to make our own such extraordinary statements as that part of the following passage which we italicise:—

'State churches, whatever relation they may bear to Christianity, are not of its essence, *any more than sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, dogmatism, or other additions which were unknown to the first disciples of Christ.* If Christianity is to be arraigned as an enemy to reason and improvement, we must put ourselves in the position of listeners to the Sermon on the Mount, and regard the original essence as a new principle of action, and a new source of spiritual life.'¹

Now we utterly decline, for the present, to consider the possibility of the absence of sacramentalism from that religion whose Divine Founder sealed it with the most solemn of sacra-

¹ The Study of History. Two Lectures delivered by Goldwin Smith, M.A. Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Preface. 1861.

ments, and specially revealed the rite to that apostle who, being 'as one born out of due time,' was not present to witness it; from that religion concerning which that same apostle wrote, 'as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' We utterly decline, for the present, to argue against the perverted views of Bunsen and Neander respecting the Christian priesthood; a priesthood which stands or falls with the reality of the great gift in the eucharist. But as for a *Christianity without dogmatism* we must take the opportunity of repeating our solemn conviction, that it never has existed, and never will exist; that the phrase itself is little better than nonsense. Christianity without dogmatism! Why, not one even of the false religions, which really live and energize, could exist for an hour without dogmatism. Show us a Mahometanism that flourishes without proclaiming the dogmas of the Unity of the Godhead and the apostleship of Mahomet; show us a Buddhism which does not teach the mystic dogma of absorption, known as Nirvana; show us a Brahmanism that knows nothing of the dogmas of incarnations of Vishnu and revelation in Vedas, and then—but not before—you may hope to make us believe in the existence of a Christianity without dogmatism.

But we are to 'put ourselves,' says Professor Goldwin Smith, 'in the position of listeners to the Sermon on the Mount.' Now, most assuredly, it is not among theologians of the patristic school that that divine discourse will meet with any want of reverent study. Canon Wordsworth, in his edition of the Greek Testament, gives references to authors, ancient and modern, 'for an exposition of this Sermon, and its fruits in human society.' Dean Trench has devoted a special volume to the teaching of S. Augustine upon it. Dr. Moberly has recently issued a course of Sermons on the Beatitudes. We might easily enlarge the list.

Nevertheless, to see even the Sermon on the Mount singled out in this manner seems strange. An author, not long since criticised in this Review, has talked of the whole of Apostolic Christianity being contained in a single text. The Professor of Modern History does not venture to impose such a limitation as this. But the principle involved is the same, and in either instance we equally demur it.

'We must put ourselves in the position of listeners to the 'Sermon on the Mount.' And why not of listeners to the discourses recorded by S. John? Is the Professor prepared to say that these last may not be, in their own way, as important as the former? It is true that we may in this latter case find it somewhat difficult to escape from the pressure of that sacramentalism and dogmatism, which are here represented as additions

to the doctrine of Christ. But unless we intend to select for ourselves what portions of the Holy Gospels we will accept, and what reject, these problems must be fairly faced.

Nor is this the only difficulty which, in our humble judgment, besets the view of this gifted and accomplished writer. Let us try for a moment (so far as it is possible) to follow his advice literally.

We listen, then, to those eight Beatitudes, which have been termed *quasi octo Christi paradoxa*; and shortly after we hear the following words: 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' Here is surely a clear recognition of a dogma; namely, the divine authority of the law and the prophets. Now this is one of Gibbon's stumbling-blocks. He complains of the Reformers that (like their Roman Catholic opponents), 'with the Jews they adopted the belief and defence of all the Hebrew Scriptures.'¹ Nor is this all. As the speaker utters these words, and then proceeds *emphatically* to contrast the older precepts with his spiritualized expansions and modifications, the question *must* inevitably arise in the mind: 'Who is this that dares to place Himself on a level with the law delivered of old?' 'But I say unto you (Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν)?' The Church's answer is simple and obvious. He, and He alone, who gave the law can possess authority thus to modify and enlarge it. What Professor Goldwin Smith says, we do not know: but even with his abilities, he would, we suspect, find it extremely difficult to give any clear and intelligible reply without trenching upon his profession of 'Christianity without dogmatism.'

To return, however, to the volume before us. If the author of such a work can, in these days, hope for comparatively few readers only; it does not the less remain true that those few become in their turn instructors of many, and that most influentially. It is not easy, in days of laxity and misbelief, to overrate the influence exercised by those who know distinctly what they hold, and why they hold it. Teachers, thus fortified, find welcome listeners, even when their system is that of a narrow Calvinism: much more may we hope for a full and lasting blessing upon their labours, when their range of theology embraces so wide, and yet so well divided and marked-out a territory, as that of primitive Catholic theology.

Among the checks to that spirit of worldliness which embraces us on every side, and whose presence must often startle those who are at all watchful over themselves, is certainly to be reckoned the study of theology. This is true of all its branches.

¹ Decline and Fall. Chap. liv. *versus fin.*

Yet, without detracting from the merit of other branches (such as exegetical or moral theology) in this respect, it is really possible that to a certain class of minds, and that a lofty one, dogmatic theology may appeal with a charm and force peculiarly its own. It may, of course, sink into coldness, formalism, and aridity, or seek to be wise above that which is written: but to admit the possibility of such fatal error is only to admit that students, even of the holiest themes, are men. Nor, indeed, are the other departments of the science in any wise free from their own peculiar dangers. What moral theology *may* become, we see in bad and dishonest works of casuistry; what *exegesis* may become, we see in the works of German expositors, and, alas! in volumes nearer home. The long list of dogmatic theologians must be admitted, even by those who have little taste for such studies, to include abundance of all that is heroic in action and devotional in temper of mind. It is something for the humblest pursuer of such investigations to be joining himself to a band that contains such names as those of Athanasius, Leo, John of Damascus, Peter Lombard, Aquinas, Bradwardine, Pearson, Möhler, Mill. And our free exposition of whatever seems to us defective or one-sided in Mr. Owen's volume must not be supposed to lessen our gratitude for a publication of so much thought and learning, which few, if any, can lay down without having added to their stores of knowledge on the most momentous themes that can engage the attention of the human mind, nor without having often been carried away in thought from things of earth,

'To where beyond these voices there is peace.'

- ART. IX.—1. *Kaiserwerth Deaconesses.* Masters.
 2. *The First Ten Years of the House of Mercy, Clewer.* Masters.
 3. *Thoughts on Religious Communities, or Letters of two Friends.* Masters.
 4. *The Constitutions of the Guild of S. Alban.* Masters.
 5. *Hospitals and Sisterhoods.* John Murray.
 6. *Church Deaconesses.* J. H. and J. Parker.
 7. *The Oxford Churchman's Union.* 1st Report. Oxford: Vincent.
 8. *Historical Sketch of English Brotherhoods.* Masters.
 9. *Josiah Woodward's Rise and Progress of Religious Societies of London.* Published 1712.

It is probable that the heading of this essay will raise but a confused suggestion as to its contents. The schemes of religious combination are now proportionably numerous and varied, as the principle itself is, in this country, new and untried. Amid pressing demands for work to be done, and the almost overpowering sense of how much has been left undone, we resort to the principle of association, as at least the most promising remedy. It is the observation of Bunsen that the principle of association, in religious matters especially, is one of 'the universal and significant characteristics of the age.' ('Signs of the Times.')

However this may be, under the particular circumstances of this Church and country, there is no cause of wonder that something like united feeling and united effort should be awakened. Independently of the fact that this principle has so long been utterly dormant in the Church, and therefore must eventually vindicate itself, the well-known state of religion in this country is such as to raise the most serious doubts whether some important resources in our Christian warfare may not lie hidden as yet amid the prejudices and worldliness which have encompassed us. We do not say that the Church of England has done less to commend itself to the masses, as they are called, than other Churches. In all ages, and in all countries, the consistent professors of religion have been a scanty minority. The History of the Church is but an expansion of the prophetic parable of the seed-sower: but though we may admit that no new thing has happened to us, it is always our duty to see whether any especial defects in our organization have contributed to any especial failures. One deficiency in our parochial system seems to be prominent.

No one can read the assertion lately published by the Additional Curates' Society, that in thirty-four of our great towns, fifty-two per cent. attend no place of worship whatever, without the thought, that surely some fresh organization might at least be tried; while, if the inquirer proceed further in the subject, the former report will tell him, that the average number of people to each clergyman in parts of the metropolis is about 5,000; of sittings available for the poor, in some of the richest parishes, about one to every twenty. Let him further ask of clerical friends engaged in our larger cities, and he will discover that there are cases which have failed to invite the assistance of any but the home missionaries of dissent, where the nominal charge of 15,000 or 20,000 has been committed to a single man. From such data as these, it was calculated in a recent report of Convocation, that at the end of this century the number of practical heathen in our large towns will be raised to 74 per cent.

In attempting to deal with this subject, we have to meet also a second difficulty: there are no precedents by which to try and to compare the methods which come under our notice; designs of the most opposite character drawn from Protestant Germany and from the Roman Catholic orders of charity have, by turns, excited the public mind.¹ But of schemes of practical self-devotion the Church of England presents no authorized standard; we might catalogue our schools and hospitals, and show an honourable list, but when we look for personal sacrifice and Christian labour, but little offers itself beyond the service of the hireling or the individual efforts of a few, whose names are justly cherished but whose example has never been elevated into subsequent system and permanent institution.

In attempting, therefore, to gather up the varied efforts which are now being made, into some more general and persistent form, we must deal with most as isolated portions of our Church's future, rather than as institutions which have won the character of tried usefulness. The increased earnestness of the present day has, by God's mercy, suggested the solution of a

¹ For thirty years past the *Béguines* of Flanders, and the *Sœurs de la Charité* of France, have been referred to in popular publications on the social condition of England.

The '*Hospitals and Sisterhoods*' cites a valuable extract from Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, urging a '*Protestant Diaconate*' to be raised from the lay orders of Communicants.

The English Woman's Journal, a periodical employed in the discovery of the due part of women in the world, frequently urges the associated principle. For the last few years, the Kaiserwerth institution has furnished the most widely spread idea of combined religious work, at least for women. An order of nurses to be trained upon that model was contemplated by Sir E. PARRY for the Haslar Hospital, but totally failed.

mighty problem, which for three hundred years has been only faintly entertained; we mean religious associations for charitable labour; a problem which, as we will endeavour to prove, is as closely connected with the cultivation of personal holiness throughout the Church, as it is with the stemming of the torrent of vice and impiety, which is yearly gaining on our neglected multitudes.

Though the basis of religious associations may be extremely various, the main object of those which are in the present day attempted, is that of practical charity. The interesting little work, 'Hospitals and Sisterhoods,' arose from an inspection of the hospitals of this country. The result of extensive inquiry and correspondence was, that so far was any religious impression from being regularly aimed at, that not even outward tenderness of manner and treatment could be secured for the sufferers. The writer then put out the idea of so educating the nurses as to enable them to act in subordination to the chaplain; but this was responded to on all sides by the assurance of its impossibility; the character of persons supplying the office of nurse being often destitute of even moral principle. Some were altogether abandoned, while, to fill the inferior posts, the lowest class of charwomen had to be called in. In the 'Thoughts on Religious Communities' there is the same motive, though more broadly entertained.

'Think of our closely crowded cities, and of the hundreds within them of sick, and suffering, and dying, with no one to minister to their bodily necessities, none to whisper consoling words of the "land very far off," and of that blessed and awful day when he shall see the King in His glory. Think of the little children, each possessing an immortal soul, growing up in ignorance and vice, going daily further from God and Heaven. I cannot pursue the picture—our penitentiaries, our workhouses, our prisons, all crowd before me. Why are my words so cold?'

An appeal from the Pasteur Vermeil in support of the Protestant Sisterhood in Paris, founded in 1841, is made in the following words:—

'The master calls you: He calls you to serve Him in serving His Church and His poor. You desire to give yourself to Him? Well then, you will find Him in the poor that you relieve, the sinner that you console, the sick that you nurse, and the child that you receive in His name, and what service is so sweet as that of the Saviour?'

In a statement of the 'Principles and Objects' of the Guild of S. Alban, the list of practical works contains:—

'Visiting the heathen, distressed, sick, hospitals, gaols, workhouses, &c.'

The Confraternity of the Holy Cross presents us with the following 'Spiritual works of Mercy; Instructing the Ignorant,

'Giving Friendly Council, Converting Sinners, Consoling the Afflicted.'

We quote these only for the purpose of showing what is the prominent object common to all.

In furtherance then of this main purpose, the designs which come under our review naturally separate themselves into two classes. Firstly, those which are irregular in operation, because their agents, as they claim no pecuniary support, cannot devote more than a small section of their time and energy. Secondly, those which secure to their members a common home, and claim in return the entire devotion of their powers, so long, at least, as their connexion with the society lasts. The complete conventual idea, implying a service for life, we believe has found no footing in this country. Even in the 'Thoughts on Religious Communities,' exaggerated as parts are, the restriction of perpetual vows is distinctly set aside.

In the latter class of associations we have made little substantial progress. In some, error and enthusiasm have been too closely connected with self-devotion; about all, public suspicion is as yet keen and watchful.

The late Bishop of London is quoted as expressing himself, 'deeply anxious for the establishment of female institutions, where the energies of mind and body should be devoted to the service of Christ, yet regretting that he had seen one institution after another, established for this object, fail.' (*Hospitals and Sisterhoods*, p. 51.)

Yet the diocese of Oxford affords three instances, the silent but progressive success of one being perhaps the best testimony to the goodness of the cause generally; these are based too upon the most trying principle of gratuitous service from persons occupying the higher ranks of life.¹ The diocese of Exeter of course suggests the memory of the first of these efforts, one to which gratitude is due on the ground of courage and originality, though we would draw a veil over its later course. There are also the germs of two other associations. Bussage presents us with another, and one connected with the cherished name of Bishop Armstrong, the earliest mover in the penitentiary cause.

¹ From Mr. Carter's account we find that in 1859 there were twenty-five regular resident sisters at Clewer. During the first five years sixty-seven penitents had passed through the institution. The Oxford and Wantage Institutions are smaller. The Devonport sisterhood is sufficiently strong to maintain the following objects:—An orphan home, receiving twenty-seven; a school for sailor boys, with twenty-six; a home for destitute girls, containing twelve; another for old sailors; an industrial school which gives employment to 120 young women; lodging-houses for poor families, containing 160; also for young women; a ragged and evening school, with seventy; a home for destitute children, and soup-kitchens. Besides these there are connected institutions in London and Bristol.

London has six or seven ; that of All Saints being, as Clewer, immediately under episcopal sanction and visitation, and destined we trust to share a like portion of credit. A few more might be added, but the list soon closes ; and one cannot help the thought, if these institutions are among the permanent desiderata of the Church, how long a time must elapse, at the present rate of progress, ere they are planted through the country ?

Notwithstanding the admirable constitutions of Clewer and All Saints, we think that eventually it must be found necessary to embrace within the existing system a plan of indirect payment, by the provision of a home during the active years of life, and a quiet refuge in age. Such is the case at Kaiserwerth, which alone numbers 240 Sisters, and in all the fifteen kindred Protestant institutions of which the Pastor Hiedner has given a report.

Doubtless there is more to admire in our own institutions, where there is nothing to gain, and all, in a worldly point of view, to lose, by those who join them ; but it seems unlikely, until the door is open to a lower class of persons, that they can ever be sufficiently numerous. And this does in fact seem contemplated by Mr. Carter, who proposes possibly to retain in service for the establishment some who have gone through its penitential course. In the Sisterhood of S. Vincent de Paul, the most extensive and useful association of the kind that exists, the highly educated, whose work of charity is spiritual instruction, whether in the hospital or the parish, are relieved of menial duties by those who enter the society from a lower position. These number about 12,000, spread over most of the countries of Europe, besides America. Upon this subject the imaginary correspondent in 'the Letters of the two Friends' remonstrates that much of the work assigned to our Lady Sisters of Charity might be as well done by 'servant-maids.'

We can fully applaud that self-sacrifice which will apply the highest powers of mind and education where the work can be best done by such resources ; but in large institutions, there must be many offices which can be honestly and faithfully filled by the class to whom Providence has assigned them, and surely to employ these for the stipulated reward of a secure home and a religious life would violate no principle. At any rate, if this system is worked with such effect in Germany, where the Protestant deaconesses number already 430, why not in England ?

To put the question in a more palpable form, we may say that there are estimated to be 25,000 persons employed in the work of attending the sick ; why should not these be trained to it as a religious duty, and authorized by the Church to carry the consolations of religion as part of their professional office ?

We cannot see the inconsistency of two distinct grades being connected with one establishment; there will be abundant duties for both, duties which will sufficiently intermingle to strengthen the ties which a common home and a common daily worship would necessarily create. We suppose that their chance of maintenance from the country would be equal to that of the Scripture readers (where they were useful there they would be supported). They might be sent out upon their service with more ease than women from the higher orders generally could be. No person who understands the needs of the poor would fail to recognise the blessings of such an agency, which, in the asylums of Germany or the villages of France, has been so effective. We have known the attempt several times made to establish a parish nurse; we cannot say that we have ever known it satisfactorily carried out. There would be others also, besides the nursing sister, to rally round such institutions, were the sacredness of humble office in the Church better realized, and any method of training set on foot.

We should notice here, as a grateful token of the voluntary system of charity, the Workhouse Visiting Society. This is a movement which may, in due time, awaken as much sympathy as the penitentiaries have done within the last few years. It is abundantly needed. Scarcely any point of social degradation can be more striking, than the fact that our workhouses, the most extensive of our national charities, have been but a stage above the prisons; and this not only in the prejudices of those who enter them, but in their actual management. We cannot understand why there should be such difficulties as are asserted in the way of their better regulation. 'It is impossible,' says the Bishop of London, 'to bestow that kindly treatment, founded on Christian sympathy, in large establishments, where the inmates are numbered by hundreds.' From the supposed difficulty, however, has emanated a design which we are thankful to recognise: namely, an industrial home for young women, to be drafted from the workhouses, according to character, and above fifteen years of age. This home is now in operation; candidates for admission are required to be supported by weekly payments, and it is intended, that in cases of emergency or sickness in after-years, they may return.

At the same time, it is to be hoped that the Visiting Society for the Workhouses may effect an improvement in the institutions themselves. One would suppose, that, once admitted, the inmates can be placed under the fullest control; that a little charitable discernment might separate the better-minded from the impure and ruffianly society to which they are frequently exposed; that in the sick-ward some better supervision might

be carried out, both as to the comforts of the sufferers, and their intercourse among themselves. But this can never be effected by mere mercenary service, irrespective of proper training, or real love and pity towards the poor, suffering, and unfortunate.

Here, however, we have strayed beyond the limits of our first division, for this society of voluntary visitors must depend upon the fluctuating tastes and occasional impulses of those who fill its ranks; it approaches more nearly to the undefined office of the District Visitor, bound by no rules, and following no precise method.

But as we have almost exhausted this subject, so far as female work has to be regarded, we may add, in conclusion, the excellent institution of an unattached order of helpers connected with the regular Homes of Charity. These pay occasional visits only to the houses which they have undertaken to aid, the links of interest being in the meantime perpetuated by collecting alms, providing situations for penitents, and the sale of work. The *Sœurs de la Charité* have similar associated members, and no method seems so likely to spread throughout the country an interest in these institutions.

Our duty now is to give some idea of the working of certain less compacted societies, the growth and multiplication of which the few last years have witnessed. And here we are introduced at once to the associations in which men only are engaged. Though claiming some connexion with the religious societies of the seventeenth century (see Dr. Steere's 'Historical Sketch'), the modern imitations have not very much in common as to their aims, still less as to their constitution. These latter appear to be essentially an offshoot of the advanced Church principles of our day, and to aim at strength by combination, while the former were the reaction against an age of licence and profanity.

The Guild of S. Alban, in Dr. Steere's little work, justly occupies the first place in these revived associations. In an appeal on its behalf we read that they have, since their foundation about ten years ago, been engaged 'In works of piety and charity in various parts of England.' In the same paper they say, 'Wherever we have been well established, the following works have engaged our attention, and we have actively carried on as many as in each case we could. 1.—To establish or assist in night-schools for grown-up lads, or adults. 2.—To assist in the Sunday-schools, or to form them if not already established. 3.—Parochial visiting under the sanction and direction of the clergy. 4.—To provide decent and devout interment for the poor. 5.—To form societies and Church clubs among workmen. 6.—To assist in the

'Church choir. 7.—To distribute alms and notices, and to perform all such other pious and charitable works as we may have any opportunity of undertaking under the guidance of the clergy.' We find in the same account the details of their work in the way of Sunday-schools, night-schools, provident clubs open to communicants, the gathering up of unbaptized children, the dispersion of tracts, the burial of the dead in reverent and becoming manner. They have it in contemplation also to establish Sisterhoods connected with the Guild, one of which is already in operation, and suberves a general object of the society, the superintendence of a home for factory girls. In their monthly paper, 'Church Work,' may be read the account of good service done to the Church of every kind, in which it is possible for pious lay members to be occupied, from the sponsorship of neglected children to the counteraction of religious and political agitation. As a specimen of the reality of their work, we quote the following (p. 12, 'Appeal, &c.'):—

'On another occasion we were entrusted with the notices of an intended confirmation, to be distributed from house to house. We met in our rooms and said a short form of prayer together; then the parish was divided among us into small districts, and we went out, two and two, for the rest of the evening, calling at every house and ascertaining generally who were unconfirmed and what was thought by them of that holy rite. We made notes of this for the information and guidance of the clergy. We all assembled again when we had finished our labours, talked over our work, prayed together, and so went home to our rest. Those were happy evenings, and by God's grace not uselessly occupied.'

But we must not omit to notice some peculiarities of constitution, which may account for the very sectional character which this society has assumed. The utmost deference is, by their rules, paid to the clergy, who at all times have the power of visiting, and of being present at any of their local meetings. This is conceded not only to the clergyman of the parish, but to the Bishop, Archdeacon, and Rural Dean. In the first of the declarations, enforced on the admission of fellows, each has to assert, 'that it is my earnest desire to receive and maintain all 'divine doctrine, and to submit myself to all truly Catholic and 'Apostolic discipline.' We should have thought, in consistency with such an avowal, that some general sanction of the Church, or, at least, particular episcopal sanction, would be necessary; it does not appear, however, that this is sought by the brotherhood, and we are not aware that in any diocese it has been conceded. Here is an obvious point of departure from the English brotherhoods of the seventeenth century. Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Stillingfleet gave them their fullest patronage.

Neither is the Guild of S. Alban on any occasion assembled to receive admonition or encouragement from any spiritual director, another essential feature of the older societies.

We must also observe upon the positive declaration of faith required of the fellows. It cannot be said to be against the belief of any honest Churchman, but the fact of its requirement in the place of simple adhesion to our existing formularies, does suggest something peculiar in the character of the Guild. The impression, we think, cannot be resisted that there is too much of the active and external, and too little of the personal and contemplative, to form a perfect idea of a religious union. Amongst their rules and duties, all are required 'to cultivate personal holiness;' at the same time, there is no account made of religious conference; small sections of Holy Scripture are read alternately with writings of Fathers of the Church, or the life of S. Alban; but no word of comment or interrogation appears to be admitted. One would suppose that the story of the latter, unless some fresh archives have come into the possession of the Guild, would not bear many repetitions, or perhaps very minute criticism.

The Confraternity of the Holy Cross appears constructed on much the same plan as that of S. Alban. Its list of objects, though less copious, is nearly identical. As in the former, the general intention is to incite and direct the labours of the lay members of the Church. We cannot disguise our opinion, however, that the constitutions of this body exhibit those features of one-sided extravagance which must be the danger of every close religious society.

It might be alike presumptuous and uncharitable to criticise expressions of private devotion; we may be less scrupulous in attaching the charge of childishness to the forms of a society. The following prayer is an example:—

'O God, who hast been pleased to sanctify the standard of the life-giving Cross by the precious Blood of Thy truly-begotten Son; grant that we who delight in honouring the same holy Cross may ever rejoice in Thy protection,' &c.

Compared with the severe expression and well-defined purport of the Collects to which the English ear is accustomed, what does the meaning of this prayer really amount to? We might say as much of the rule quoted from the same manual:—

'That every member shall, on obtaining the consent of the warden, be allowed to put up a votive offering in the oratory, or furnish any article of devotion, such as an image of our Lady, or any saint,' &c.

After this, the reader will be the less surprised that not only a distinct profession of the faith is required on the admission of

each Brother, but that this comprises a belief in the Seven Sacraments, in the necessity of confession and absolution in every case of mortal sin, in the propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead at the altar, and in the lawfulness of asking, as well as desiring, the prayers of the Saints. The undisguised and positive statement of these tenets is somewhat startling; but it is no business of ours to debate the subject with the confraternity; we would observe only that a Society, whose object is to serve the Church by works of practical charity, is likely to find itself considerably impeded by the use of the language it has adopted. On every ground of reason and experience, it seems probable that when a religious society assumes a doctrinal attitude, so far at variance with the great body of the Church around it, the practical work of charity must soon be superseded by the necessity of battling for its own peculiarities. We have surely sufficient instances in which unscrupulous enthusiasm for an order has blinded its followers to the very principles of truth and piety.

For this reason we contend that Episcopal sanction ought at the outset to be sought by any society that would obtain the confidence of our people, or secure to itself the hope of permanent usefulness.

It may be objected that the necessary details of devotional regulation are such as would not, under present circumstances, obtain approbation in every diocese. But the well-known sympathy of Bishop Tait with the All Saints' Sisterhood is an instance to the contrary. Fully believing that only under the avowed admission of all that is catholic in doctrine and discipline these institutions can flourish, and real devotion to the work can be maintained, we have yet a full belief that fairness of consideration would be generally accorded to any scheme which bore upon its front an honest probability of practical service. Would it not in any case be better to put our faith in that grace of discernment and moderation which we rightly look for among the gifts of the Episcopal office, than to the changeful and excited temper of a body chiefly of laity, bound by no laws but what their own wisdom had suggested?

There exist also smaller societies, such as those of Almondsbury and Hatcham, framed for the same purposes of charity, and support of the Church, as the two we have mentioned. Here, likewise, the works to be undertaken comprehend the relief of the sick and poor, the conduct of schools and libraries, and all other matters in which the help of the laity is so greatly needed. We are unable to state what has been the practical working of these fraternities; but their operations being confined within the limits of their respective parishes, they furnish in one important

point the type of what we shall hereafter recommend. Only here we must again observe the over-active tendency, and the slight provision made for the increase of personal piety. Assistance in the choir, the observance of holy days, kneeling at prayer, the maintenance of Church union, frequency of Holy Communion, are insisted upon; but nothing appears in the way of mutual counsel, or any definite methods of spiritual advance. We must here give an outline of a third of these parish societies which obtained the approbation of the late Bishop of Lincoln; though, from particular circumstances, it has never been actually established. It is prefaced by the text, 'That they may be one; as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me,' and the aim accordingly is private union and edification rather than external charity. Communion three times a year is the basis of membership. Each member must be proposed by others, who shall certify the candidate's desire to lead 'a godly and a Christian life:' they pledge themselves to Church attendance under penalty of exclusion. In times of sickness their duty is to communicate with members, and to give assistance in reading and instruction to others; they are bound to family prayer, at least every night. Stewards of the society collect and distribute alms. Membership with similar societies, which may exist in other parishes, is provided for by certificate. Here all rules are to be submitted to the bishop, under the primitive injunction of Ignatius, 'to do nothing apart from the bishop.' The last rule contains this important declaration as to strict allegiance to the Church on its own plain and broad principles: 'This society does not seek to form any new association apart from that "congregation of faithful men" of which the Church consists; and that the members do no more than pledge themselves to observe those things which they are already bound to observe by their Baptism and Christian profession renewed in Confirmation.'

The first annual report of the Oxford Churchman's Union announces the further progress of the principle of combination; the designs of this Union will be best understood by a copy of their first rules, with its details:—

'I. The object of this Union is to promote the close and active co-operation of Clergy and Laity, by any of the following means, or others which may be conducive to the same end:—

'By meetings for conversation and mutual improvement. By circulating books and information on subjects of interest affecting the work and condition of the Church. By holding friendly intercourse with neighbours, with due reference to the parochial system, for the purpose of encouraging young men to take a personal interest in religion.

'By instructing the ignorant.

'By taking steps to provide improved lodgings for artisans, labourers, or casual travellers.

'By Lectures, Readings, Singing Classes, and Musical Entertainments.

'By providing places and means of recreation suitable to the seasons of the year.

'By providing refreshment-rooms for working-men, with a view to encourage temperate habits.

'II. The Union may lend its aid in forming separate associations, either general or local, &c.

'III. The Union shall consist of Members and Associates.'

The Bishop for the time being is always to be solicited to take office as Patron; the President is invariably to be a clergyman in priest's orders; the Council are composed of clergy and lay communicants in equal numbers. A Sermon, preached before the Union by the Rev. E. Palin, is appended to the Report. We trust that this item in the old English societies is to be maintained. The sermon itself is glowing and earnest, and speaks strongly upon duties of the laity in the general work of the Church.

From the printed outline of this society we look for much good service. We trust its good example may stimulate the combining tendency elsewhere, and that it may help to perpetuate the almost unique character which Oxford bears as to its parish system. We must repeat, however, what we have said as to the want of the higher and contemplative element. One noble object, indeed, of religious union is the help and influence which may be extended to those without. But are we not warranted in expecting, also, that some methods should be laid down for fostering that loftier form of individual piety towards which, in former times, association has proved so powerful an aid?

It is time now to give a few words to those English brotherhoods which, founded for the purposes of Christian communion and charitable labours, have probably influenced the rise of those of which we have spoken. Awakened by a deep sense of that 'holiness without which no man shall see the Lord,' and provoked by the frequent sights of profanity, debauchery, and suicide around them, a few young men were gradually drawn together by the preaching of Dr. Horneck and Mr. Smithies. Bishop Kidder, in his life of the former, does not attribute to him the design of founding any special society, though he says of his personal piety, 'he was a man who might have passed for a saint even in the best and purest times of Christianity.' He appears to have been the director of several, until an early and saintlike departure closed a life of anxious and intense application to the wants of multitudes.

The rare little book of Josiah Woodward's, 'Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London,' asserts that

no names of Stewards can be found previously to the year 1678; and this, also, fails to attribute any origin to them beyond what is commonly called accidental. However, the men whose character from the first conferred the task of guidance and organization, quickly turned to good account the growing tendency to combined effort. Many of these associations were founded in London, and in 1712 no less than ten existed in Dublin, under the patronage of Archbishop King. They were also attempted in the country, and so powerfully were thoughtful minds affected by the movement, that 'a very pious and learned foreigner,' for they had been established on the Continent also, writes in the following words in the year 1700:—

'For my own part, I look upon these things as comfortable signs that the Spirit of God is now about a great work, to put a new face on the whole Christian Church.'—*Josiah Woodward's account.*

In these societies a meeting took place every week; stated subjects connected with Christian life were appointed for conference; their avowed object being to apply themselves to good discourse and things whereby they might edify one another. At these meetings all were permitted to speak, within certain limitations, and 'they were accustomed to communicate their experience one to another.' These meetings were connected with the vigils and festivals of the Church, and were carried out further by frequent attendance at Holy Communion, and at the weekly sermons, preached by some chosen director. We will transcribe for illustration their first twelve subjects of conference:—

1. Self-examination.
2. Self-abasement.
3. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.
4. Repentance.
5. Effectual conversion.
6. Trust in God.
7. Humility.
8. Mortification.
9. Christian hope.
10. Christian charity.
11. Alms deeds.
12. Contentment.

Twelve occasions were observed in the year for conference on the Holy Eucharist. Specific forms of prayer were in use in these brotherhoods, which were conducted by some clergyman, and the spirit of devotion aimed at in their meetings was preserved also in their ordinary life; see, for instance, the

following points of obligation taken from the society at the Savoy :—

‘ To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again.
‘ To speak evil of no man. To pray if possible seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their going in and coming out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal.’

All were accustomed to pray daily for the society. Admission of members was by election, each supplying a written declaration of their motives on seeking admission.

The good service, however, which these brotherhoods effected for the Church, was shortened by a gradual change of object. They were soon connected with the Society for the Reformation of Manners, and the pursuit of individual piety appears to have given place to a warfare upon the sins and vices of the world.

Josiah Woodward gives a catalogue of the arrests and punishments in which they had been instrumental; among their objects, he states, ‘ The maintenance of the authority of the laws of God in this land.’ Frequent and earnest appeals are made to the secular magistrate, and we are reminded of the rigid connexion between the prison and the pulpit attempted shortly before by the Puritans. From the almost unparalleled list of crimes upon which Dr. Woodward dwells, we doubt not the temptation to this change was strong; but the salt which had seasoned their early piety must have ‘ lost its savour.’ Perhaps they knew not themselves that the ‘ weapons of their warfare’ were becoming ‘ carnal.’

On comparing the constitution of these societies with those which now claim some distant connexion with them, we are instantly struck by the large security provided for inward and progressive piety. They were busied also in the founding of schools, they distributed alms and taught the ignorant; but the weekly conference was likewise an essential. It is precisely this inward element which we believe in our present fraternities is too feeble.

Let us now approach this subject from a different point of view. If there is one thing which thinking persons believe has been defective in the Church of England, it is that of social influence; the author of ‘ Ploughing and Sowing’ represents that in Yorkshire the popular view of undertaking a religious life necessitates the joining some particular Dissenting society. The perversion could not well be greater, as being really the desertion of the Church in which generally the person has been baptized, and therefore might have been reared up to join some system

which is antagonistic to it. But does this notion prevail only in the North of England? In our usual parochial management, is there any union realized between ourselves and our fellow-worshippers, beyond that of taking the same pathway to the same house of God? Arrived there, the gradations of pews and the imperfect accommodation for the poor instantly suggest that the parish is not a community with respect to worship. We are very familiar with the sentiment, now become a widespread item of belief in this country, that occasional sympathy and union with dissent is no violation of Christian unity. The Church has no practical expression of membership, therefore no charge of schism can easily be borne out. But it will be replied, that in a national form of religion there must be a large margin comprehending the insincere and the undetermined. Let us look then among those who are admitted to our highest privileges, and ask what methods exist by which even communicants may be taught that they are one body in the Lord. Is there really much greater sense of union or mutual interest to be found amongst them? How much of bearing one another's burdens, of exhorting and admonishing one another, of seeking those things by which one may edify another, of being perfectly united in the same mind and in the same judgment? Next to the overpowering fact of the incarnation, Primitive Christianity knew no stronger attractive force than union of its members. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.' Shall we look to testimonies of the subsequent age? let us weigh such a passage as this from S. Clement.

'Night and day there was a contest among you on behalf of the whole brotherhood, that the whole number of its elect should be saved in mercy and unity; ye were sincere and without memory of injuries towards each other, and schism was hateful to you. Ye grieved over the offences of those around you, and their shortcomings ye regarded as your own; ye were constant in well doing, and ready for every good work. Perfected in all virtuous and godly conversation, ye accomplished all things in the fear of the Lord. His commandments were written upon the breadth of your hearts.'

The same outline of intercession for all Christian orders, the like remembrance of the poor, the same formal expression of sacred unity in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, remain with us, as may be found in the accounts of Justin Martyr, or in the Primitive Liturgies. Yet who that has read either can resist the melancholy impression of how little is left of the original spirit? Indeed, judging of the common standard of piety as nurtured by our parochial system, one shrinks from the comparison, whether with the Epistles of S. Paul or the writings of those who followed him. The entire subject, there-

fore, resolves itself into two questions. First, are we to see a revival of an order which is asserted to have had a distinct place in the constitution of the primitive Church, that of Deaconess? Next, can we so improve the social working of the Church, so enlarge the sphere of sympathy, and deepen the channels of its communion and fellowship, 'that every member of the same may realize his vocation and ministry?' The excellent pamphlet of Mr. Hayne, who has himself opened a Training Institution for Deaconesses, shows, by detailed argument from the Epistles, that the office is as old as Apostolic times. The recent article in the *Quarterly*, to which the Bishop of Salisbury has invited the attention of his clergy, has done the same; and we suppose that few who have any acquaintance with the accredited Commentaries on the Epistles have any doubt of the fact. It is clear, then, that as a Church we have run the risk of laying aside one definite item of primitive constitution in hitherto withholding from female helpers their due sanction and appointment. Three times in the last few years has the subject received the favourable notice of Convocation; we trust that it will not be long ere those to whom it is one of deep and earnest feeling, may be supported by the encouragement they have a right to expect from a Church whose basis is primitive authority.

We must be excused a digression here while we advert to the kindred fact so freely conceded as to be nearly ignored, namely, that the Church of England has practically lost the office of Deacon also. We need not delay to ask what similarity there can be found between this initiatory step towards the full clerical office, which almost invariably follows within two years at the furthest, and the original institution. The real functions of the Diaconate seem in great part assumed by the Scripture Reader. We have no great sympathy with 'The Church of England Scripture Readers' Association,' but we cannot help quoting the following passage, suggesting, as it does, much of the primitive notion of a Deacon carrying the Word of Life in all directions, as Philip at Samaria, or on the road to Gaza.

'During a period of fourteen years' visitation by a single Reader, 23,986 visits have been made to the poor of every class and character; 3,408 infants and 102 adults have been baptized on his recommendation; 2,016 children, and 158 male and 237 female adults, have been induced to attend the schools of the parish; 307 persons have been led to attend church who never attended before; 429 persons have been confirmed, and 269 have become Communicants during visitation by the Reader; 48 persons have been induced to marry, who before lived in open sin, and 334 persons have been visited during illness that terminated in death.'

Might not the Church improve the title of 'Church of England Association' by conferring some form of minor ordination on

those who do such work as this? We believe that in the Diocese of Exeter, Deacons' orders have been given with a view of their being perpetual, and not a necessary step to the priesthood. Supposing, however, that our Scripture Readers were raised to the regular office and title of Deacon, and the scanty band of Sisters of Charity were invested with the Church's blessing and authority, and both orders multiplied a hundred-fold, there would in our opinion remain a defect unrelieved—a defect relating, as we have pointed out, to the congregation itself. Incalculable as would be the service of a permanent Diaconate of both sexes, there must be the idea of 'a royal priesthood, a chosen generation,' more widely spread through the whole body, at least of Communicants. Without this the ceaseless yearning towards union and mutual support must still be unsatisfied, and the Christian profession within our Church remain to a great degree cold and inoperative.

In our view, then, the question now at issue is not merely the loss or the revival of offices originally apostolical, such as that of Deacon and Deaconess—and this has been well put by Mr. Hayne—but one of far deeper and wider interest: whether the loftier capacities of personal piety and of Christian labour shall find their home of shelter and their place of operation within the Church of England.

It may here be answered that the constitution of our Church being the opposite of democratic, any extensive sympathy among its members is of necessity repressed, and, indeed, could not be attained without the sacrifice of order and subordination. That we owe much to the complete independence of the clergy we doubt not. In the improvement of our ritual, and other such changes, which have never at first been popular, the fact seems not less than providential. But we cannot think that perfectly autocratic relation of the clergy towards the people, which the law concedes, and which is furthered by our high social position, will really stand the test of apostolic precedent. We have seen how greatly it has been modified in the American Church and in the Colonies; in both instances the attachment of the laity being secured by their larger share in the regulation of the Church, and proportionately increased intelligence of its principles. In our own system, the people's churchwarden is their sole necessary representative; it has been at the pleasure of the Incumbent himself to descend from his almost irresponsible position, and to invite freer means of intercourse. The fruits of this system have been such as would be naturally anticipated. From the vast extent of our dioceses, episcopal interference has never been what our theory supposes it should be. Hence the Parochial Clergy have had it in their power to do or leave

undone almost as much as they pleased. The legal requirements of Sunday work being fulfilled, the real ministry of souls, for life or death eternal, has been a matter of mere chance. Hence the total discrepancy between the internal condition of one parish and its neighbour; the fortunes of each being, in fact, left to rise or fall with the individual who for the time has charge. Whilst the Congregationalists and Wesleyans have awakened interest and vitality throughout their body, have had their class-leaders, their school-teachers, their deacons, their local preachers, and these unpaid, many of our largest parishes have been almost destitute of persons willing to take up the most obvious duties of charity.¹ Whilst they have developed an incessant energy and progress, by giving office to all who are willing to assist, the clergyman has numbered but his two or three stipendiaries, schoolmaster, clerk, and sexton. This want of participation in the actual work of the Church, we suppose, explains a common observation, that of all religious bodies Church people understand least of their own principles. Whilst the Dissenters as a body have shown their power in obtaining two weeks of special prayer connected with the revivals, for the last two years, in not half the parishes of England could there be found ten persons who ever make the slightest observance of the authorized Festivals and Fasts; while our standard calls to preparation and repentance at Advent and Lent are, as yet, but a mere shadow through the land. One diocese alone is a grand exception. Salisbury, we believe, is following.

We are not here speaking in despondency, nor, as we trust, in disrespect; but we must draw attention to certain glaring deficiencies, which we maintain should be honestly met and patiently considered. Nor are we forgetting the noble exceptions which have been witnessed, and in all of which, as at Leeds and Yarmouth, the principle of lay combination has been much aimed at. We are speaking of things only as they must appear in the eyes of disinterested observers; and we believe that the review of the last century and a half of our Church presents the mind with a system which has attracted too little of love, and set up but a feeble standard of devotion.

As a reaction, the Puritans established private meetings with free conference upon Holy Scripture. Soon after, the Independents assumed the right of extempore prayer, on the delusion of the gifts of prophecy being restored to the

¹ A case is before the writer's mind of one of the largest and wealthiest churches in London, where the clergy themselves were accustomed to spend entire days in distributing and registering tickets of charity. He was told that one lay-helper was all that could be found.

congregation at large. We know the history of their suppression: the deep mind of Laud foresaw that connexion, with which we are now familiar, between the theory of an indiscriminate priesthood and outright infidelity. The Church, arrayed in the learning of ages, maintained her own lofty reserve. She demanded obedience to her canons as echoing the voice of catholic authority; firm was her faith in her own right and mission—a faith which has bequeathed to us a Liturgy sound in essentials, and with it the solemn guardianship of mysteries still unrecognised by the natural man. Strong and noble was her confession when the storm of rebellion quickly undermined all that had been erected for mankind to respect, whether of human law or Divine Revelation. But, at the same time, with the entire extinction of Puritanism, the Church was the loser of one element of life and strength. The interest and personal responsibility of her lay members was greatly impaired. Their ideas of discipline, and the common attempt to make their visible Church co-extensive only with the holy and converted, were as impracticable as those of the Novatians. We remember how Baxter invited his parish at Kidderminster to join in his Church discipline, and give in their names. Out of 1,600 of an age to be communicants, only 600 united with him. But the other point for which they contended, the more extended interest of their lay members, is not thus easily answered. The taunt of Owen, in his ‘Nature of a Gospel Church,’ is, that the Church of England only admits of spiritual gifts as connected with office, ‘and supposes that all distinct ‘offices may be done well enough by one or two in the same ‘office.’ Whatever may be the interpretation of their favourite passages, such as Rom. xii. 5—8, Ephes. iv. 11 (and we agree with Thorndike that Lay eldership is completely mythical), and however this mention of varied functions may have reference to the pristine form of the Church, the general impression is irresistible, that something more is needed for the original idea of a Church society than priest and congregation, or preacher and audience. We believe that it has been from the increasing sense of this truth, that the piety of the present age is striving to fix itself on some fresh forms of social union and effort.

It is now our duty to show under what restriction, and with what encouragements, we believe lay agency might be adopted. We have already stated our opinion, that such unions should be attempted as parish institutions, believing that, on a large or small scale, they might be available with good effect everywhere. We would adopt, therefore, as our maxim the rule already quoted from the Lincoln Association, that our society ‘does

'not seek to form any new association apart from that congregation of faithful men, of which the Church consists.' It is to work in harmony with the Church, with the sole endeavour of giving point to its rules, spreading intelligence of its principles, and extending its sphere of holy influence.

There appear to be three aims which chiefly suggest themselves in the association which we are supposing. 1st.—Devotion. 2d.—Discipline. 3d.—Charitable labour. And we should judge, that in the formation of a religious society, these objects would be attained in the order we have laid down. It would not be difficult to find some persons in every parish whose anxiety for their own spiritual state would lead them to embrace some specific scheme of preparation for Holy Communion. It would naturally consist of the reading of Holy Scripture in common, conference upon it, and subsequent prayer. The second point then would quickly present itself; the private regulation of their own lives, and strict obedience to such rules as the Church has laid down for their direction. To engraft the third object would then be a matter of small difficulty; for, 'from the abundance of the heart' good feeling and the desire to help in the salvation of others would easily spring forth. Let us attempt an outline of rules upon each of these heads. 1st.—Let a meeting of all members take place each month, men and women separately, all being of course supposed to be communicants. 2d.—Let a subject of conference be appointed always beforehand. 3d.—Let one of the parochial clergy preside. 4th.—Let the president refer to appropriate passages of Scripture connected with the given subject, and let any be invited to add illustrations, or to ask questions. 5th.—Let an appointed office of prayer be compiled with special reference to the aims of the society, holiness of life, devout communion, and works of charity. 6th.—Let every member be bound to pray three times a day, always making some distinct intercession for the welfare of the brotherhood. 7th.—Let every member be encouraged to bring before the meeting any points of difficulty connected with Christian life.

Under the second head would come,—

1.—Strict observation of the Lord's Day, with due attendance at church. Each being accountable to the society for any failure in these points.

2.—The devout observance of Advent and Lent, with the positive engagement to make these seasons the opportunities of special prayer, both privately and publicly, with due attendance upon week-day sermons.

3.—The observance of the festivals and fasts of the Church, implying at least attendance at evening service, when there

should always be a sermon especially framed for the day. This rule shall also include all Fridays as days of abstinence, or at least of particular penitential prayer.

4.—Holy Communion should be received once every month at the least, and this never without special preparation.

5.—Every one should seek perfect reconciliation with their neighbours beforehand, and should do their utmost to spread a spirit of peace and forgiveness amongst all.

Every member should on entrance be enrolled, having been previously elected on his own promise of obedience to and co-operation with the association. A certificate, with date of election, and with the specified work of each, should be supplied.

Under the last head of charitable labour would come all such offices as we have alluded to in reference to the Guild of S. Alban, teaching at schools, singing in choirs, relief of the sick, &c.

In every case the active members should definitely undertake some one responsible work, and should give account of this at some stated periodical meeting of the society. The other members should as distinctly pledge themselves to everything contained under devotion and discipline.

A few duties perhaps might be added to the list of the Guild, such as receiving Holy Communion with the sick, and assistance in the conduct of missionary services; possibly some such services, held merely in houses, might be conducted by an authorized lay member alone, with the caution that anything in the way of a sermon should be not original, but invariably read from a book. We believe that the clergy might be greatly aided in the outlying parts of country parishes by such duties taken up by pious laymen, reserving at the same time their own proper position.¹ A parallel list of duties might be drawn out for the female helpers, including all that is at present attempted by our district visitors. But we do not suppose that all would be active members. The observances connected with the first two heads, Devotion and Discipline, might be profitably entered upon by many, who from various causes could not render active assistance. In such cases their prayers, alms, and counsel, would be a sufficient contribution to the work of the society.

We should lay it down as a standard regulation, that a meeting of the whole body should take place each quarter, at which the progress of its various works, its expenditure, its prospects, and its difficulties, should be gathered up and read; and this,

¹ The various Dissenting bodies have established a complete network of such devotional gatherings in all the neglected corners of our parishes; they are mainly conducted by their laity. Our 'Cottage Lecture' is generally regarded as a piece of extraordinary devotion on the part of the clergy.

of course, would imply the offices of steward and treasurer, as well as president. The entire body would form a council, and every member should be bound to communicate to the society, through the president, any subject which he thinks would tend to the well-being of the Church. We should suppose, also, that about the time of the general meetings a solemn occasion of public worship in the Church should be appointed, and that some accredited preacher should be invited by the president to address the society upon such subjects as the blessedness of Christian union, or the higher requisitions of the spiritual life. On these occasions there should be a combination with any other similar societies. If held at any hour after the usual time of work, both men and women of all grades might easily attend; or it would be sufficient if these larger meetings took place once or twice in the year. Lastly, we suppose that the sanction of the Diocesan should in all cases be sought to the rules and the operations of the society, and that, if possible, he should, by some formal act of authority, give his blessing to the work.

Let us now briefly inquire what advantages might be derived from the scheme we have described. That the particular works of charity are to some degree already taken up, and executed with zeal and self-denial, we are ready to admit. But almost invariably there is a lack of workers, and what is done is scarcely ever done by *men*; usually it is by young ladies—the most impressible and willing, but the least reliable agents. Add to this, that there is very little feeling of responsibility attaching to the so-called task of District Visiting; no kind of instruction; not a shadow of probation. Any spare hand among a series of unmarried daughters is supposed efficient. Hence, from the unfitness of the present agents, it is generally found impossible to carry out anything of the sort where it is most needed, that is, in large and degraded populations. We repeat, it is *men* that are wanted. In the Society of S. Vincent de Paul there are male associates drawn from the trade, the merchant, and the independent class. If they can be found in considerable numbers to work in connexion with the parochial clergy, and give so many hours a week of charitable labour, why should not the religion of this country command equal respect, and the Church of England open a way for the same willing service? May it not be, that we have been hiring Scripture Readers, when we had them in our own parishes, if we had only sought them?

Next, let us consider the immense impetus which would be given to this lay agency, if raised into a diocesan institution. One parish would speedily follow another—where once established it could scarcely die out, and the spiritual well-being of the

community, with its works of charity, could scarcely be, as now, dependent on the single character of the clergyman. We add, too, the encouragement which many a timid heart would receive, and the strengthening of many a feeble hand by the feeling of sympathy and the participation of intercessory prayer. Imagine, too, the altered phase of many a family, high and low, from having one of its members connected with the association. That one might be the link between both piety and charity, and ten or twenty who had been strangers to both. Another general effect, which, with the Divine blessing, we might predict is, the positive advance in devotional life through the Church at large. One fundamental defect in our present labours of charity is, that they are so indirectly connected with our own spiritual progress. Work and prayer have not been sufficiently united. The one should react upon the other, interchanging loftiness of motive with reality of action. Another result we might look for is the improvement of our worship. At present very rarely is any account made in the execution of our ritual of any but those of the lowest religious capacity. Hence is the Liturgy read very much as a lecture to those who are not supposed to have entered at all into the heights of its meaning. Sermons are generally, and perhaps rightly, aimed towards conversion, because they are delivered to the masses. We hardly know of an instance where the early celebration of Holy Communion ever is made the occasion of any more fervent kind of address. Do those who are thus satisfied see that they are really reducing the entire body of the faithful to the mere level of Catechumens? Hence one uniform low standard has prevailed, and the Holy Eucharist, as the line of distinction marking off the full Christian profession, has been ignored. Might not the societies we have attempted to delineate both furnish the methods of a more vigorous Christian profession, and the means of that loftier religious literature which hitherto we have found only in the Continental Church or in the mediæval cloister?

In speaking thus of associations in parishes, we by no means desire to undervalue the intention of those who have attempted to revive the female diaconate in our recent sisterhoods.

But we believe that the former are almost equally important. There always has been a large amount of Christian zeal and energy outside the clerical order. It was so in apostolic times, and it found its satisfaction in the more intense appreciation of those duties and relations which are really incumbent on us all. It was so in the Church of the middle ages. The Franciscans in their origin were but a community of lay Christians, who studied apostolic simplicity and self-abnegation; the Waldenses

were the same, though the one order was adopted by the Western Church, and the other failed to make its terms; multitudes of associations might be quoted to the same purpose. And there exists about the Church of England a broad margin of spiritual life and activity; but unfortunately, not only without the ranks of the clergy, but outside even its lay communion. It has issued in forms often of wild and startling enthusiasm. A late lay preacher at Exeter Hall (an ex-prizefighter) announced that the Gospel would soon find its way into every corner of London, not by an exclusive order vested in 'night-shirts,' but by the voice of every man who felt its truth. In the Irish revivals has been proclaimed the monstrous delusion of a fresh Pentecost, together with such theories of private illumination and assurance as, if true, would render all claims of the Church and its sacraments either superfluous or an imposture.

But this cannot be said of the Wesleyans or of the many settled forms of dissent around us. They have indeed commonly proceeded to the utter denial of any existing sacred Church system upon earth, thus opening the way to total scepticism as to the means of grace or standard of truth. This, however, was very often not the tenet with which they commenced their course. Vast numbers have been drawn in by the simple attraction of social sympathy, the greater opportunities of charitable work, and sometimes by the facility of obtaining ministerial office. Fearful as is the spectacle of modern dissent, we cannot regard it as a mere congeries of mischievous heresy, which the Church is well rid of; we believe religious association in the Church itself presents the only chance of arresting it.

ART. X.—1. *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London: Murray.

2. *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani*, MCCCXV—MCCCCH. e Codd. MSS. sumptus præbente Cæsareâ scientiarum Aca-
demiâ, ediderunt FR. MIKLOSICH, Prof. Univers. Vindobon.
et Jos. Müller, Prof. Universit. Patavinæ. Tomus prior.
Vindobonæ: Carolus Gerold. 1860.

3. *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανονῶν τῶν τε ἀγίων καὶ πανευφύμων ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συνόδων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀγίων πατέρων, ἐκδοθέν, σὺν πλείσταις ἄλλαις τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν διε-
πούσαις διατάξεσι, μετὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐξηγητῶν, καὶ διαφόρων ἀναγνωσμάτων, ὑπὸ Γ. Α. ΠΑΛΛΗ καὶ Μ. ΠΟΤΛΗ, ἐγκρίσει
τῆς Ἀγίας καὶ Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας. Ἀθηνῆσιν,
ἐκ τῆς τυπογραφίας Γ. Χαρτοφύλακος, 1852.*

4. *Le Raskol: Essai historique et critique sur les Sectes religieuses en Russie.* Paris: A. Franck. 1859.

5. *Histoire, Dogmes, Traditions, et Liturgie de l'Eglise Armenienne Orientale.* Par E. DULAURIER. Paris: A. Franck. 1859.

NOTHING can show the increased and increasing interest which attaches itself to the Eastern Church, more than the fact that the Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford should have chosen it for the subject of his first series of lectures. And the argument is the stronger, because Dr. Stanley would never,—and, in several passages of the work we are to consider, he confesses as much,—have chosen that subject of his own accord. He seems almost to apologise for such a selection; and promises his auditors that, if they will listen patiently to him now, he hopes to take them hereafter into more stirring scenes, and epochs of more vital importance to ourselves. Whatever we may think of the necessity for such an apology, we at all events earnestly hope that he may long be spared to fulfil his promise.

It would be in the highest degree disrespectful to Professor Stanley himself, and indeed to the University in which his lectures have been delivered, to give merely a cursory glance at his work. The only question is, in what way we may most thoroughly take it into consideration. And after some thought, we believe that we can pursue no better plan than this: to go through it, chapter by chapter in order, directing the attention

of our readers to the many eloquent passages which occur in it, while at the same time we shall not shrink from pointing out some errors in fact, and some assertions which an Eastern Christian (to say nothing of ourselves) would consider errors in opinion.

In the first place we are disposed to find fault with the very title of the work. These lectures on the Eastern Church consist of three parts, in addition to a very able introduction. The first contains a history of the Council of Nicæa, of which it is scarcely possible, as a work of art, to speak too highly: the next a brief sketch of the rise of Mahometanism, on which we shall have to pass a very different verdict: and the third a dissertation on the Russian Church, which, if not equal to the first part of the work, contains much which will be new to English students of Church history.

We will commence then with the Introduction: and we can give no better idea of the whole tone of the work than by the following quotation which occurs at the very commencement:—

‘I have said that the field of Eastern Christendom is a comparatively untrodden field. It is out of sight, therefore out of mind. But there is a wise German proverb which tells us that it is good from time to time to be reminded that, ‘Hinter dem Berge sind auch Leute.’ This, true of all large bodies of the human family, from whom we are separated by natural or intellectual divisions, is eminently true of the whole branch of the Christian faith that lies in the far East. Behind the mountains of our knowledge, of our civilization, of our activity—behind the mountains, let us also say, of our ignorance, of our prejudice, of our contempt—is to be found nearly a third part of Christendom: one hundred millions of souls professing the Eastern faith. No theory of the Christian Church can be complete, which does not take some account of their existence. The proper distances, the lights and shades, of the foreground which we ourselves occupy, of the prospect which we ourselves overlook, cannot be rightly represented without bearing in mind the enormous, dark, perhaps unintelligible masses, which form the background that closes the retrospect of our view.’

And then follows this noble passage:—

‘It is a Church, in fact, not of cities and villages, but of mountains and rivers, and caves and dens of the earth. The eye passes from height to height, and rests on the successive sanctuaries in which the religion of the East has entrenched itself as within natural fortresses against its oppressors; Athos in Turkey, Sinai in Arabia, Ararat in Armenia, the cedars of Lebanon, the catacombs of Kieff, the cavern of Megaspelion, the cliffs of Meteora. Or we see it advancing up and down the streams, or clinging to the banks of the mighty rivers which form the highways and arteries of the wide plains of the East. The Nile still holds its sacred place in the liturgies of Egypt. The Jordan, from Constantine downwards, has been the goal of every Eastern pilgrim. Up the broad stream of the Dnieper sail the first apostles of Russia. Along the Volga and the Don cluster the mysterious settlements of Russian non-conformity.’

Nothing can be truer or more beautiful than this. But now let us ask how it comes to pass that so many historical events,

at least as nearly connected with the Eastern Church as was the Council of Nicæa, find no place here? Why not, more especially, the Council of Chalcedon, which, in the very teeth of Rome, elevated Constantinople to the second rank? Why not the Fifth Council, so famous from its anathema pronounced on a Roman Pontiff? Why not the *Quinisext*, the very source of Ecclesiastical law in the East from that time to this? Above all, why not the Council of Florence, the history of which (about to be translated from the Russ) will be no small addition to English Ecclesiastical lore? Again; in a series of Essays on the Eastern Church,—embracing, as our author does, heretical as well as orthodox communions under that title,—some space ought surely to be allotted to that marvellous Nestorian Church, which in the eleventh century out-numbered Eastern and Western Churches taken together. Surely something also of the Paulicians, the only existing immoral heresy of the East. Surely, too, of the controversies connected with Cyril Lucar, and the Councils of Constantinople and Jassy, and above all, of Bethlehem: and also that of Constantinople in 1691, which we believe has never been noticed in any English Ecclesiastical history.

These Councils are undoubtedly events of the highest interest in the Eastern Church; and no doubt in any series of essays on that subject which profess to be complete, they ought to have found a place. At the same time, as Dr. Johnson once said, 'an author is not bound to tell us more than he will:' and, therefore, we ought to be thankful for that which Professor Stanley has told us. Let us look a little more closely into his first lecture.

I. We must, in the first place, enter our most strenuous protest against one of its earliest sentences: 'The Greek dialect of the East, after the sixth century, becomes almost intolerable to the eye and the ear of the classical student.' We suppose that the author would tell us; in the first place, how worthless is the general style of composition employed by the Greek Church: in the next, how barbarous are its measures.

To commence with the last charge. It was a sad loss for us English scholars when the accentual pronunciation of Greek was surrendered for a fancied prosodiocal theory. Up to the Revolution of 1688, the older system, that taught in Europe by the refugees from the fall of Constantinople, undoubtedly prevailed. It has left traces in our language even to this day. Maria we might indeed have obtained through the Latin: but why *Sophîa* instead of *Sophîa*? Why *S: Hêlēna* (the island) instead of *S. Hêlēna*? And so it may be observed in all mediæval Latin poetry, we find such an accentuation as,—*Lucîa*,

harmonia, melodia, theoria, theologia and the like. Take again Milton. How often has that line been pronounced utterly inharmonious :

‘ And Tiresias and Phineus, prophets old.’

Undoubtedly had the poet’s pronunciation been that which ours is, he would have written :

‘ And Phineus and Tirēsius, prophets old.’

But he pronounced Tiresias with the accent on the penultimate ; that is, if a merely English reader would understand us, he would have had his line read thus :—

‘ And Tiresēias and Phineus, prophets old.’

Making a synalœpha between the syllables *ei* and *as*. In fact, the barbarism of Greek pronunciation is certainly on our side. Read a passage from Demosthenes, according to the strictest rules of our universities, to an Athenian scholar, and it will be an excess of courtesy only, which can prevent his smiling at your ludicrous mispronunciation.

Now we must make one allowance, at the commencement. We cannot affirm of the Greek, as we may, with great probability, of the Latin, that the regeneration of the language, under the influence of the Church, was but a return to the general type of its earliest poetry. When we read such a hymn as the—

‘ Pange lingua gloriosi prœlium certaminis ;’

we are reading a rhythm not unlike that which the

‘ —rusticorum mascula militum
Proles, Sabellis docta ligonibus
Versare glebas, et severæ
Matris ad arbitrium recisos
Portare fustes—’

would at once have recognised as their own. But we cannot say, that S. Cosmas of Maiuma, or S. John Damascene, in like manner returned to the metres of Thespis or his contemporaries. Still, Professor Stanley would, we are sure, have taste and courage enough (and we will rather accuse his deficiency of reading on an out-of-the-way subject, than imagine any want of true criticism on the part of so very elegant a writer) to admire the Eastern Church, for throwing herself boldly into a new theory of rhythm. The new wine could not be poured into the old vessels. What! stanzas of this kind intolerable to the classical student? We will boldly match them against any strophe of,—what they should really be compared with,—Pindar, both for the poetry and for the metre; provided it be granted, that S. John Damascene had as good a right to prefer accent to quantity, as Pindar had to subordinate the former to the latter.

αὕτη ἡ κλητὴ καὶ ἁγία ἡμέρα,
ἡ μία τῶν Σαββάτων,
ἡ βασιλὶς καὶ κυρία,
ἐορτῶν ἐορτῇ,
καὶ πανήγυρις ἐστὶ πανηγύρεων
ἐν ἣ εὐλογοῦμεν Χριστὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Δεῦτε τοῦ καινοῦ τῆς ἀμπελίου γεννήματος,
τῆς θείας εὐφροσύνης,
ἐν τῇ εὐσήμεν ἡμέρᾳ
τῆς ἐγέρσεως,
βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κοινωνήσωμεν,
ὑμνοῦντες αὐτὸν, ὡς Θεὸν, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

* Ἄρον κύκλω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου, Σιών, καὶ ἴδε·
ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ κασί σοι
θεοφεγγεῖς ὡς φωστῆρες,
ἐκ δυσμῶν, καὶ βορρᾶ,
καὶ θαλάσσης, καὶ ἐώας τὰ τέκνα σου,
ἐν σοὶ εὐλογοῦντα Χριστὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Now, do not let it be said that we are not staunch admirers of the old heathen lyrical bard, and we give him the full glory of which some modern critics seem disposed to deprive him. But now let us compare what, to our mind, is the finest passage of the classic, with a parallel place (by no means the finest we could select) from the Christian poet.

ἴσον δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ,
ἴσα δ' ἐν ἀμέραις ἄλιον ἔχοντες ἀπονίστερον
ἐσλοὶ δεδόρκασι βίον, οὐ χθόνα ταρασσόντες ἐν χερσὶ ἀκμῇ
οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ
κεινὰν παρὰ δίαταν· ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν τιμίῳ
θεῶν, οἵτινες ἔχαιρον εὐνοκίαις, ἄδακρυν νέμονται
αἰῶνα· τοὶ δ' ἀπροσόρατον ὀκχέοντι πόνον·

ὅσοι δ' ἐτόλμασαν ἐστρὶς
ἐκατέρωθι μέλναντες ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων ἔχειν
ψυχάν, ἔτειλαν Διὸς ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν· ἔνθα μακάρων
νῆσσαν ὠκεανίδες
αἰραὶ περιπνέουσιν, ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει,
τὰ μὲν χερσὶθεν ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων, ὕδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει,
ὄρμοισι τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκονται καὶ κεφαλᾶς.—κ.τ.λ.

They are glorious stanzas, we most willingly allow; yet perhaps scarcely so glorious as the following¹ fragment, especially if we regard it as sung in the calm brilliancy of a Mediterranean sunset.²

¹ It is marked (1) in the fragments of the *Θρηνοί*.

² See Disson's Note on the Isthmia, iii. §1. 'Quod autem occidente sole hæ inferiæ cœptæ fieri, illustratur loco a Müllero notato: Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 587. Τοῖς μὲν οὖν κατοικοῦμένοις ὡς περὶ ἡλίου δυσμὰς ἰναγίζουσι, τοῖς δὲ Ὀδρανίδαῖς ὑπὸ τὴν Ἑω, ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου. Idem dicit Scholastes ad hunc Pindari locum: "Ἔθος πρὸς δυσμὰς ἱερουργεῖν τοῖς ἥρωσι, κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς.'

τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος δελίου τὰν ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω
 φοινικορόδοις τ' ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι προάστιον αὐτῶν
 καὶ λιβάνῳ σκιάρα καὶ χρυσίοις καρποῖς βέβριθεν
 καὶ τοὶ μὲν ἵπποις γυμνασίοις τε, τοὶ δὲ πεσσοῖς,
 τοὶ δὲ φορμίγγεσσι τέρπονται, παρὰ δὲ σφισιν εὐανθῆς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος·
 ὁδμὰ δ' ἐρατὸν κατὰ χῶραν κίδναται
 αἰεὶ θύα μινύντων πυρὶ τηλεφανεὶ παντοῖα θεῶν ἐπὶ βωμοῖς.

Yet we will not fear to match with these, the following stanzas from All Saints Sunday; which we choose, however, not so much for their mere beauty, as from the identity of their subject.

Ἱερωσύνην ἱερὰν,
 Οἱ Ἱερεῖς καὶ Ποιμένες,
 ἐνδυσάμενοι, καὶ ταύτην ἐμφρόνως
 κυβερνήσαντες, Χριστέ,
 ἀξίως κατεκόσμησαν διδασκαλίας λόγον,
 ἄνωθεν ὄντως πλουτήσαντες.
 ὠριαωθέντες καλλοπαῖς
 τῆς πρώτης καλλοποιῖας
 καὶ φανέντες, ἀπλανεῖς ὡς φωστῆρες,
 οὐρανῶσατε Χριστοῦ
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Ἅγιοι, ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, ταύτην
 ποικίλως κατακοσμήσαντες.

νόμφῃ πειθόμενοι τῷ σῷ
 τῶν μακαρίων οἱ ὅμοιοι,
 πολυτρόποις ἀρεταῖς φαιδρυνθέντες,
 ἐκκληρώσαντο μονᾷς
 τὰς οὐρανίους, χαίροντες· ἄλλην γὰρ ἄλλος
 ταύτας ἀξίως ἐπληρώσαν.

τὴν οὐράνιον πύλην καὶ κιβωτὸν,
 τὸ πανάγιον ὅρος, τὴν φωταυγὴν νεφέλην ὑμνήσωμεν.
 τὴν οὐράνιον κλίμακα, τὸν λογικὸν Παράδεισον,
 τῆς Εὐας τὴν λυτρωσίν,
 τῆς οἰκουμένης πάσης τὸ μέγα κειμήλιον
 ὅτι σωτηρία ἐν αὐτῇ διεπράχθη τῷ κόσμῳ,
 καὶ ἀφίσεις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐγκλημάτων.

Now if any one, admiring the stanzas of Pindar quoted above, can yet call these 'intolerable to the eye and the ear,' we cannot argue with him. There have been persons, we know, who, while lavishing a life in emending the inanities of Silius Italicus, or the bombast of Statius, could call the *Dies Irae* barbarous. So York Minster has been called 'a barbarous church, but large, of the Gothique sort.' We say it fearlessly,—there is as much art in the accentual disposition of the stanzas of S. Cosmas of Maiuma and S. John Damascene, as there is in the metrical arrangement of Pindar. But the former requires as much study as the latter; and till that study (and it is not a work of two or three months) is freely bestowed, the Christian Canons will be deemed barbarous by those who lavish their admiration on the Pagan Epinicia.

II. We proceed to another remark of our writer;—and here again we must enter our protest. ‘The system has produced no practical works of Christian benevolence.’

There is a city deafened by the roar of two thousand cannons and mortars, a fiery hail sweeping every street,—the blue sky blotted out by volumes of smoke,—deadly rockets, hissing forth destruction, in the air, shells ploughing up the thoroughfares or demolishing the houses. The assault is made by sea and by land: and surely if ever hell seemed let loose, it was so on that day, and round those devoted walls.

Nearly in the centre of this city is an hospital—a long, white, low erection. The besieged have planted a black flag over it, as if to implore, in the name of a common SAVIOUR, that the artillerymen will spare that building. And they do spare it, as far as they can. Nevertheless, its sides are riddled with cannon-balls, and every now and then a bursting shell spreads terror and dismay among its inmates.

In the large room are crowds of wounded, in every stage of mortal agony; the surgeons, worn out with toil, are amputating still, still operating, and every moment fresh cases, more terrible groans, more frightful lacerations. In this room there are, also, twelve Basilian Sisters; there they have been ministering for the last six and thirty hours—there they will remain till the final catastrophe. Every palliasse sends its own stream of blood to the red lake that covers the whole floor, now nearly ten inches deep—to be deeper still, ere the day’s work is over—and sends up its horrible, sickening odour. And when those Sisters shall have an hour’s leisure to return to their convent, their feet will be ingrained with blood¹ above the ankle-bone, and the exertion and the stench will have sown in every one of them the seeds of typhus, under which half will sink. Is not this ‘practical Christian benevolence’?

Again: look at the Lazar-villages in the Archipelago, where once to enter is to enter for life; and look at the Basilian nuns who immerse themselves in those abodes of despair, knowing that, in all human probability, they must themselves fall victims to that living death. The fearful character of the disease itself, the awful misery of the closing scene, the singular way in which it affects mind as well as body, generally with the most miserable languor and depression, sometimes with even more fearful impulses, make this a work of the most sublime heroism—a heroism to which the Latin Church (and no fault of hers) has

¹ The writer was informed of this fact by an Eastern Priest, who had it from the Hegumene of the Convent in Sebastopol;—she herself having assisted in washing the feet of her Sisters on their return.

nothing to oppose. Again, is not this 'practical Christian benevolence'?

Once more: we know from the accounts of travellers what is that most dreary, most fearful waste of Siberia, with its countless versts of monotonous sand, marked out by equally monotonous post-houses. Who is it that has planted civilization here and there over those vast steppes,—that has accommodated even the immutable Eastern Offices to the wandering habits of those nomad tribes,—that has Christianized, to an extent beyond that which is generally imagined, the steppes of Central Asia? Let the work of the late Alexander Stourdza, the Russian missionary-historian, answer the question.

And yet again: we know the efforts that Rome has made to get a footing in China; the labours of the Jesuits, the manner in which they endeavoured to soften the offence of the Cross, the very small result of their toil; and, in spite of their zeal and learning, their final repulse. And Russian missionaries, without this world's learning, setting forth the doctrine of the Cross in its austere form, have obtained a footing among that most extraordinary people, where Rome has utterly failed. Is not this a 'work of benevolence'?

III. The next point on which our author enters, is the territorial division of the Eastern Church. He divides it thus:—

- '1. The National, or so-called Heretical Church of each country.
- '2. The Orthodox branch of each Church in communion with the See of Constantinople.
- '3. The United or Catholic branch, consisting of converts to the Roman Catholic Church.'

Now, it is scarcely possible not to remark on the preconceived theory of which those words, 'the National, or so-called Heretical Church,' are only the expression. There are Churches, as we shall presently see, intensely national, which have never had stain of heresy; though we are quite willing to allow that it does so happen, that most of the Eastern National Churches are, at the present time, heretical. Let us go through Canon Stanley's list.

(a) The Chaldeans or Nestorians: once the most widely extended Church on earth; now, and especially since the fearful massacres from which of late years they have suffered, reduced to the inhabitants of one valley. It is well known that many modern writers have regarded the Nestorians as the remnant of the Ten Tribes, and they seem by no means ill-pleased to be so considered. It would have been well had our author given some idea of the present numbers of this once enormous Church. They may be stated, we believe, as follows (we partly depend on Mr. Badger's most excellent work,

which was published in 1852, and partly on later information, which we have ourselves received from local researches).¹

1. Mosul, the Patriarch See, 6,800 souls.
2. Bagdad, 380 souls.
3. Diarbekr, 720 souls.
4. Sert, 1,850 souls.
5. Mardeen, 380 souls.
6. Jezeerah, 1,120 souls.
7. Kerkook, 1,274 souls.
8. Khosrâwa, 900 souls.

To these we may add a few scattered families near the Great Zab, in the mountains of Buhtân, and in other detached and lonely villages. But the members of the Church which once outweighed East and West together, do not now, at the very outside, exceed 18,000.

(b) *The Armenians.* This, next to the Orthodox Church of the East, is by far the most powerful of all its communions. The seat of its Patriarchate, Etchmiadzin, under Ararat, is the most venerable of all the ecclesiastical buildings of Asia. The union of these so-called heretics with the Orthodox Church, has been attempted again and again, and will probably some day be carried out. We may fairly believe, that the heresy itself merely arose, in the first place, from the accidental absence of every Armenian Bishop from Chalcedon; and, in the next, from the poverty, in that respect, of the language, which had at that time but one term for Nature and Person; so that when the six hundred and thirty fathers declared that CHRIST was in and of two Natures, the Armenians understood them to say, that He was in and of two Persons. Otherwise their doctors speak with sufficient clearness on the subject. For thus writes S. Narcissus of Klaens:—

‘We acknowledge the oneness
Without thereby changing the natures :
But the same Son, Who is GOD from the FATHER,
Is also Man from the Mother :
And we say, that thus there is one Nature (Person)
By means of an union not to be described :
Even as our soul and body are united in one nature.
For although they are only things created,
Yet they form one human nature without any change.
Out of the Immaterial and the Material,
One whole is formed, in an incomprehensible manner.’

One peculiarity of the Armenian Church is its reception of four Canonical books not acknowledged by any other Communion: two in the Old Testament—the History of Joseph and Asenath, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; two in

¹ The above list is not given by Mr. Neale, in his Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church. His letters, he tells us, of inquiry, either never reached their destination, or the reply was lost.

the new—the Epistle of the Corinthians to S. Paul, and the Third Epistle of S. Paul to the Corinthians. The former commences thus:—

'1. Stephen and the elders with him, Dabuas, Eubulus, Theophilus and Zenon, to Paul our father and evangelist, and our faithful master in JESUS CHRIST, health.

'2. Two men have come to Corinth, Simon by name and Cleopas, who vehemently disturbed the faith of some, with deceitful and corrupt words:

'3. Of which words thou shouldest inform thyself.

'4. For neither have we heard such words from thee, nor from the other Apostles.

'5. But we know only, that what we have heard from thee and from them, we have kept firmly.

'6. But in this the LORD has had much compassion on us, that, whilst thou art yet with us in the flesh, we shall again hear from thee.

'7. Therefore do thou write to us, or thyself come to us speedily.

'8. For we believe in the LORD, that, as it was revealed to our brother Theonas, He hath delivered thee from the hands of the ungodly.

'9. Now these are the wicked words of these filthy men; for thus say they and teach:

'10. That we ought not to believe in the prophets:

'11. Nor to say that GOD is Almighty:

'12. Nor to believe in the Resurrection of the Body:

'13. Nor that man was created by GOD alone:

'14. Nor that JESUS CHRIST was born in the flesh of the Virgin Mary:

'15. Nor that the world was the handiwork of GOD, but rather of some one of the Angels.'

The work that stands last on our list is a very good *resumé* of the history and rites of the Armenian Church.

(c) The Syrian, or Jacobite Church. The See of Antioch may be said to have five nominal Patriarchs. 1. The Orthodox Possessor, at present Hierotheus, in communion with the rest of the Eastern Church. 2. The so-called Latin Patriarch. 3. The Jacobite, or Monophysite Patriarch, whose seat is at Diarbekr. 4. The Latin Patriarch of the Uniat Jacobites, whose seat is at Mardeen. 5. The Maronite Patriarch. It shows how completely Rome has ignored the old theory of the five-fold aristocracy of the Church, to find that she actually recognises two Patriarchs of the same See; the one, an ornamental Patriarch, residing in Europe, and useful for processions and the like; the other, a Patriarch for the converts of a particular sect, and who does the real work of the See. The Patriarch of the Maronites, she probably would theoretically recognise only as the ecclesiastical chief of that nation. Professor Stanley gives no particulars of the native Jacobite Church of Syria. It has, however, in addition to its Patriarch, at the present moment, eight Metropolitans and three Bishops. 1. Mosul, which gives its title to the Patriarch. 2. Mar Mattai, near Mosul. 3. Diarbekr. 4. Urfah. 5. Kharpoot. 6. Mardeen. 7. Jerusalem. 8, 9. Temeloyo, *Universal*; that is, without a particular See.

10, 11, 12. Ascetic Bishops in Jebel Torr. It is exceedingly difficult to give any guess at the numbers of the Syrian Monophysites, but we overstate them at 200,000. These, too, though never rivalling the Nestorian Missions, yet, in Mediæval times, formed a Communion of no small importance, and can boast writers of great eminence. The chief of these is undoubtedly Gregory Bar-Hebræus, otherwise called Abu'lfaraj, who was born in 1226, and died Maphrian of the East, in 1286. (Maphrian was the title of the second dignitary in the Jacobite Church, a kind of Vice-Patriarch or Catholicos.) His annals are the best and, indeed, only history of the Asiatic Church in the Middle Ages which we possess. Of almost equal celebrity was Dionysius Bar-Salib, Bishop of Amida, who lived from 1140 to 1207. But the learning of the Jacobite Bishops is evinced by no other fact so much as this; the vast number of Liturgies which they composed for their various Churches. Nearly forty of these have been published in a Latin translation, by Renaudot. A friend of the writer of the present article has an almost perfect collection of them in Syriac, which it is earnestly to be hoped may some day see the light.

The Maronites, whose sanctuary is Mount Lebanon, and with whom so fearful a tragedy has, within the last few months, been connected, were, originally, the sole remains of the Monothelite heresy. In the year 1182, by the exertions of the Latin Patriarch of Antioch, Aymeric, they were reconciled to the Roman Church; and now, though their offices are strictly oriental, and, in some respects, unique, they may be called the most ultramontane people under the sun. Besides their Patriarch, they have eight Bishops, one of whom is resident in the Isle of Cyprus, where there are many Maronites.

In connexion with Antioch, we rather wonder that Professor Stanley has not mentioned that very curious sect, the Christians of S. John the Baptist. It is difficult to say, whether they are to be considered heretics or christianising pagans. They profess to be disciples of S. John Baptist; they receive no part of the Bible, except the Psalms; their sacred city is Haran, the city of Abraham; they pay a certain religious worship to the stars; the volume to which they attach most importance, and of which, we believe, a translation has never been published (and travellers are not agreed what is the original language), is called the Testament of Adam; to which we may add, that they are in the habit of very frequent baptism.

From Asia, Professor Stanley takes us to Egypt. There, as it is well known, the Orthodox Church is absolutely extinct; the Patriarch and his three Bishops residing at Constantinople, but without any local cure. The Coptic Patriarch, who lives at

Cairo, is the virtual representative of the proud old Church of Athanasius and Cyril, and has thirteen or fourteen Bishops under him. The sacred language of this communion, now utterly unintelligible to nine-tenths of Egyptian Christians, is the oldest employed by any Church; the same which Moses heard at the court of Pharaoh, and through which he became learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. One cannot but hope that, in God's mercy, Monophysite though it at present is, there may be a great future for this Church. It has, within the last twenty years, experienced a remarkable revival; all the intellectual offices of Egyptian governments are filled by Copts; they exhibit the most remarkable facility for learning English, so that we have been told of cases, in which a man, who, at the beginning of the year, had never heard an English word, at its end conversed in so perfect an accent, that it was scarcely possible to distinguish him as a foreigner. Then again, the highway from England to India must, more and more, bring the two peoples into contact; and the Bishops of Egypt are now, and have always been, very well disposed towards the English Church.

And, as the daughter of the Coptic Church, we are bound to notice the Ethiopic. Professor Stanley describes this admirably. 'The Church of Abyssinia, founded in the fourth century, by the Church of Alexandria, furnishes the one example of a nation savage, yet Christian; showing us, on the one hand, the force of the Christian faith, in maintaining its superiority at all against such immense disadvantages; and on the other hand, the utmost amount of superstition with which a Christian Church can be overlaid, without perishing altogether. What-ever there is of Jewish or of old Egyptian ritual preserved in the Coptic Church, is carried to excess in the Abyssinian. The likeness of the sacred Ark, called the Ark of Sion, is the centre of Abyssinian devotion. To it, gifts and prayers are offered; on it, the sanctity of the whole Church depends. There, alone, the Jewish Sabbath is still observed, as well as the Christian Sunday; they are the only true Sabbatarians of Christendom. "The sinew that shrank," no less than the flesh of swine, hare, and aquatic fowl, is still forbidden to be eaten. Dancing still forms part of their ritual, as it did in the Jewish temple. The polygamy of the Jewish Church lingers here, after having been banished from the rest of the Christian world.' Our author might have added, that here, alone, is circumcision considered of equal necessity with baptism. 'The endless controversies respecting the natures of CHRIST, which have expired elsewhere, still rage in that barbarous country.' There are no less than sixty-nine different opinions, as to the

manner and extent of the hypostatic union, each of which has its doctors and its enthusiasts, even at the present day, in Abyssinia.

Here our author concludes his list of National Churches—all of them, hitherto, heretical. But we think we have reason to complain, that he has used the two adjectives as if they were synonymous. For he should have added—and the omission is remarkable—the Georgian Church, as a Communion most intensely national, and yet, at the same time, thoroughly orthodox from the beginning. It was, perhaps, not to be avoided, that this lovely country should fall to the protection, at first, and then to the domination of Russia. Its last independent monarch, George XIII., was unable, on his deathbed, to provide in any other way for the safety of his country and its Church. As late as 1795, the Persian armies overran the whole kingdom; the Catholicos, S. Dositheus, was slain in his own church, and his aged and venerable mother, after undergoing the most horrid insults, was roasted alive. It is a pity, that those who have wasted so much compassion on the patriotism of the Circassians, with their religion compounded out of Mahomedanism, a worship of the devil, and a superstitious adoration of the Cross, are not a little better acquainted with the real facts of their history; the hundreds of churches which they have destroyed—the multitudes of priests whom they have tortured to death; the vast territories, once fields and meadows, smiling with Christian cultivation, now deep, dense forests, through their barbarous incursions. Few persons are aware, that Georgia, even at the present day, has mediæval village-churches as frequent as our own; towers, spires, bells, frescoes, wayside crosses, churchyard crosses, tree crosses (a usage, we believe, peculiar to Georgia), and that frequently in the depth of a hitherto unexplored forest, when some new road is being cut out, or timber felled, the workmen come upon a church of the eleventh or twelfth or thirteenth century, perfect even to its lovely mouldings and its curious frescoes. We are quite sure, that, whenever the work shall appear, the *Georgian Travels* of Mr. George Williams will amply repay the study, not only of the ecclesiologist, but of the English Churchman.

And the Georgians may well feel a national pride in their never-broken orthodoxy. There are few nations who can show such royal saints as David III., surnamed the Restorer; Susanna, Princess of Ran and Martyr; and Ketevan, whose glorious confession, under Shah Abbas, filled even the Roman Church with astonishment. There are few more interesting biographies, only at present they are unfortunately shut up in the Russian language, than those of S. Anthony of Marleop, S. Shio of Mgvim, S. Eustatius of Mtsketha, S. Joseph of

Alaverd, and S. Dodo. So great, indeed, is their interest, that when a brief history of the Georgian Church, by M. Jossilian, was published at S. Petersburg in 1843, the first edition of a thousand copies was sold in six weeks; a sale, for Russia, scarcely inferior to that of Macaulay's History, among ourselves.

In proceeding to speak of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and in that, first of the Greek, Professor Stanley has some excellent remarks on the character of the Mother-Church of the world.

The early Roman Church was but a colony of Greek Christians, or Grecised Jews. The earliest fathers of the Western Church, Clemens, Irenæus, Hermas, Hippolytus, wrote in Greek. The early Popes were not Italians, but Greeks; the name of Pope is not Latin, but Greek,—the common, and now despised, title of every pastor in the Eastern Church. * * * * The humblest peasant who reads his Septuagint, or his Greek Testament, in his own mother-tongue, on the hills of Bœotia, may proudly feel, that he has an access to the original oracles of divine truth, which Pope and Cardinal read by a barbarous and imperfect translation.

Most true: we only wish that the magnificent Vulgate had been differently characterised by our writer. The remark about the early Roman Church receives a fitting illustration if we look at the greetings which fill the 16th chapter of the Romans. Let us write down the names mentioned by the Apostle, italicising those that are clearly Greek. *Epenetus, Andronicus, Junia, Amplias, Urban, Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus, Herodion, Narcissus, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, Philologus, Julia, Nereus, Olympas.*

Our author groups the Orthodox Churches thus:—

Greece, properly so-called.
The Byzantine Church.
The once barbarian northerns.

(a) Bulgaria and Servia (Slavonic).
Wallachia and Moldavia (Romance).

The last named provinces, Latin in origin, Greek in doctrine, counterbalance Bohemia and Poland, Slavonic in origin, Latin in doctrine.

The Raitzen of Hungary,
The Dalmatian Orthodox,

the westernmost outposts of the Eastern Church.

(b) Russia.

To these he should have added, as we have remarked, Georgia, as having a distinct nationality; Orthodox Syria; and Jerusalem. It is true that the orthodox in the latter Patriarchate are little more than a Greek colony, and that since the sixteenth century, no native Christian has ascended the throne of S. James. But the Syrian Church has considerable vitality; and its late eminent Patriarch, Methodius, the greatest and holiest man who had for centuries filled the throne of

S. Ignatius, did much to reinvigorate his province. We believe that the population of the various dioceses has never yet been published in this country; it may interest some of our readers, and we can vouch for its accuracy.

Tyre and Sidon	5,600
Damascus	4,800
Berrhcea (Aleppo)	8,000
Epiphania	4,160
Laodicea	4,000
Seleucia and Heliopolis	2,000
Amida (Diarbekr)	500
Tripoli	7,800
Bostra	50
Emessa	3,200
Berytus	20,000
Adana	1,400
Acre (the Antiochene diocese of that name)	12,080
Palmyra	(<i>titular</i>)
Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum)	50
	<hr/> 73,640

Lamentable as is this total, in comparison with the days of Antioch's glory, it yet is vastly superior to the number of the still existing Monophysites within the same dioceses; and it is, therefore, unfair, in all ways, to speak of these latter as the exclusive National Church.

IV. The Professor next proceeds to compare the general tendencies of Eastern and Western Churches. Making allowance for the unavoidably rough and trenchant nature of an apophthegm, he observes, truly enough, that 'the Western Theology' is essentially logical in form, and based on law; the Eastern 'is rhetorical in form, and based on philosophy. Hence the disputes and heresies of the East have been, strictly speaking, in *theology*—relating not to man, but to God: and they (with the exception of the Arian) have raged but little in the 'West.' Our author, however, speaks a little unguardedly on this point, since the Aquileian and Istrian Churches formed a schism which lasted a hundred and fifty years, rather than receive the condemnation of the Three Chapters, as derogatory to the Council of Chalcedon.

Again: in the eleventh century, Germany was warmly agitated by a controversy on the use of certain expressions, which were supposed to be Nestorian; and the defenders of the Catholic doctrine,¹ in some cases, used language which cannot

¹ A history of this controversy, which is of some importance, remains to be written. The usual Church historians, Baronius, Fleury, Natalis Alexander, Cabassutius, say little or nothing of it. It came to a crisis in the Council of Babenberg, A. D. 1151. The best accounts of it that we know are to be found in (a) Hansiz, *Germania Sacra*, tom. ii. (the History of Salzburg), pp. 228—252; and (b) in the Preface of Pez to vol. v. of the *Anecdota*.

be vindicated from a charge of Monophysitism. Neither must the Adoptionist controversy, in Spain (a strictly *theological* one, if any ever were) be forgotten.

It is more universally true, that the Pelagian and Predestinarian controversies never created any interest in the East, where the endless disputes on 'merit,' 'demerit,' 'satisfaction,' 'imputed righteousness,' 'inherent righteousness,' are quite unknown.

V. We must be briefer when we allude to the Professor's observations on the Sacramental differences between the two great Churches. It is not wonderful that he calls the change, by which Confirmation has been transferred from infancy to youth, 'a salutary innovation.' It ought always, however, to be remembered, that it is an alteration even later than the disuse of the chalice, and that it was at first introduced in compliance with simply Pelagian arguments. It is worth while noting, that the custom of the Spanish Church (at least in many of its larger cities), a Church so curiously, in some respects, approximating to, as curiously in others diverging from, the maxims of the East, places Confirmation at the age of three years. So in the administration of the Holy Eucharist, once and no more, to infants, most undoubtedly the primitive practice, our author strongly approves the very late modern change. In the less authoritative and more precatory form of absolution, Professor Stanley seems to claim some kind of affinity for the East with Protestant views. Would he,—it was well said to us,—be content to have our Prayer-Books, as the Euchologies are, stamped on the outside with the Seven Sacraments, *μετάνοια* claiming its place as one? We rather wonder that he has not alluded to the difference of position at the reception of the Blessed Sacrament. Considering that, at the time of the Reformation, the custom of kneeling had an origin not further removed from Cranmer and Ridley than they from us, we must ever look at it as a special interference of God's good providence, that the earlier—and for a thousand years universal—practice was not restored. What a handle would the change have afforded for future Zwinglianism! No; while practices, good or bad, of an earlier date were ruthlessly swept away, this, the especial object of Puritan attack, was obstinately maintained. We do not call to mind any examples in English Ecclesiology where a font or a capital represents a standing reception; but in France such a representation is not uncommon, even down to the twelfth century.

Into the question of the Double Procession, on which Canon Stanley has a brief appendix, we will not go.

VI. The next lectures treat of Nicæa and Athanasius. They

are, on the whole, the ablest and by far the most picturesque of these lectures. But what particular connexion, as we have said before, that Synod has with the East, when compared with *e.g.* the Quinisext, or the Seventh, or Florence, or Bethlehem, we do not see. We must suppose that, having well got up the subject, our Professor thought this a favourable opportunity of producing his notes. Only we must enter our strongest protest against the—we know not whether more unjust or more laughable—comparison, which finds in Professor Jowett another Athanasius,—in Mr. Mansell a second Arius. The picturesque style of the detail may be quoted from the following extract.

‘In the close of the month of May, 1853, it was my good fortune to be descending, in the moonlight of an early morning, from the high wooded steeps of one of the mountain-ranges of Bithynia. As the dawn rose, and as we approached the foot of these hills, through the thick mists which lay over the plain, there gradually broke upon our view the two features which mark the city of Nicæa.

‘Beneath us lay the long inland lake—the Ascanian Lake, which, communicating at its western extremity by a small inlet with the Sea of Marmora, fills up almost the whole valley—itsself a characteristic of the conformation of this part of Asia Minor. Such another is the Lake of Apollonias, seen from the summit of the Mysian Olympus. Such another is the smaller lake, seen in traversing the plain on the way from Broussa.

‘At the head of the lake appeared the oblong space inclosed by the ancient walls, of which the rectangular form indicates with unmistakable precision the original founders of the city. It was the outline given to all the oriental towns, built by the successors of Alexander and their imitators. Antioch, Damascus, Philadelphia, Sebaste, Palmyra, were all constructed on the same model of a complete square, intersected by four straight streets, adorned with a colonnade on each side. This we know to have been the appearance of Nicæa, as founded by Lysimachus, and rebuilt by Antigonos. And this is still the form of the present walls; which, although they inclose a larger space than the first Greek city, yet are evidently as early as the time of the Roman Empire, little later, if at all, than the reign of Constantine. Within their circuit all is now a wilderness; over broken columns and through tangled thickets, the traveller with difficulty makes his way to the wretched Turkish village of Is-nik, which occupies the centre of the vacant space. In the midst of this village, surrounded by a few ruined mosques, on whose summits stand the never-failing storks of the deserted cities of the East, remains a solitary Christian church, dedicated to “The Repose of the Virgin.” Within the church is a rude picture, commemorating the one event which, amidst all the vicissitudes of Nicæa, has secured for it an immortal name.

‘To delineate this event, to transport ourselves back into the same season of the year,—the chestnut woods, then, as now, green with the first burst of summer, the same sloping hills, the same tranquil lake, the same snow-capped Olympus from far brooding over the whole scene, but in every other respect, how entirely different!—will be my object in this lecture.

‘From the island of Cyprus there arrived the old shepherd Spiridion, a shepherd both before and after his elevation to the episcopate. Strange stories were told by his fellow-islanders to the historian Socrates of the thieves who were miraculously caught in attempting to steal his sheep, and of Spiridion’s good-humoured reply when he found them in the morning,

and gave them a ram, that they might not have sat up all night for nothing. Another tale, exactly similar to the fantastic Mussulman legends which hang about the sacred places of Jerusalem, told how he had gained an answer from his dead daughter, Irene, to tell where a certain deposit was hidden. Two less marvellous, but more instructive stories, bring out the simplicity of his character. He rebuked a celebrated preacher at Cyprus for altering, in a quotation from the Gospels, the homely word for "bed," into "couch." "What! are you better than He who said 'bed,' that you are ashamed to use His words?" On occasion of a wayworn traveller coming to him in Lent, finding no other food in the house, he presented him with salted pork, and on the stranger's declining, saying that he could not as a Christian break his fast.—"So much the less reason," he said, "have you for scruple; to the pure all things are pure."

'These wonderful powers were exerted, it was reported, actually on his journey to the Council. One night he, with a cavalcade of Orthodox Bishops, arrived at a caravanserai, where, as it so chanced, a party of Arians were assembled, also on their way to Nicæa. The Arians determined to seize this opportunity of intercepting the further progress of so formidable an accession to their rivals. Accordingly, in the dead of night, they cut off the heads of all the horses belonging to Spiridion and his companions. When, as is the custom in oriental journeying, the travellers rose to start before break of day, the Orthodox Bishops were dismayed at the discovery of what had befallen their steeds. A word from Spiridion, however, was sufficient to rectify the difficulty. He replaced the decapitated heads, and his party proceeded on their journey. When day broke they found that the miracle, performed in the dark and in haste, had restored the heads at random—black heads to white shoulders, white heads to black shoulders; in short, a caravan of piebald horses.

'Many more stories might be told of him, but, to use the words of an ancient writer, who has related some of them, "from the claws you can make out the lion." Of all the Nicene fathers it may yet be said, that, in a certain curious sense, he is the only one who has survived the decay of time. After resting for many years in his native Cyprus, his body was transferred to Constantinople, where it remained till the capture by the Turks. It was thence conveyed to Corfu, where it is still preserved in the cathedral of that island. Hence, by a strange resuscitation of fame, he has become the patron saint, one might almost say the divinity, of the Ionian Islands. Once a year, in solemn procession, he is carried round the streets of Corfu. Hundreds of Corfiotes bear his name, now abridged into the familiar diminutive of "Spiro." The superstitious veneration entertained for the old saint is a constant source of quarrel between the English residents and the native Ionians. But the historian may be pardoned for gazing, with a momentary interest, on the dead hands, now black and withered, that subscribed the Creed of Nicæa.'

Then follows a lecture on Mahometanism; which, both on literary and theological grounds, we heartily wish omitted. But after the—now celebrated—article which appeared long since in our own pages, and to which, in its published form, we would earnestly refer the reader, it would be a work of supererogation for us to speak on the subject.

The rest of the volume is taken up by the Russian Church; and we will return to that, for the purpose of offering a few remarks on it, when we have first said something of the other volumes mentioned at the head of the present article.

VII. It is scarcely possible to overrate the value of the 'Acts of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate,' from 1315 to 1402, as edited from Viennese MSS. by the distinguished scholars Miklosich and Müller. They were brought, about 1550, to Vienna from Constantinople, by Augerius Ghislain de Busbecke, where they have lain since, unconsulted and almost unknown. They are referred to, however, by Lambecius, in his 'Notes on the Imperial Library at Vienna' (viii. 1065), in the *журналъ народнаго просвѣщенія* (1847), and in the 'Slavische Bibliothek' (i. 123—158). The view they give of the intense energy of the Byzantine Church, in that century which is usually considered the age of its miserable decrepitude, the curious way in which titles are the more closely clung to, the more the meaning of those titles is gone, yet also the real loving piety of a time in which the Eastern Church is commonly considered a mere heap of formality, and the very curious character of some of the cases here detailed, make the publication invaluable. We will give a few specimens of the documents in question, which run through a series of eleven Patriarchs: John XIII. (Glycys), Isaiah, John XIV. (Calecas), Isidore, Callistus I. and Philotheus, Nilus, Antonius, Macarius, Callistus II., Matthew.

We may remark, that the greater part of this period is celebrated for the controversy between the fanatic or dreamer Gregory Palamas, on the one hand; and, on the other, Barlaam and Acindynus, as to the Uncreated Light of Mount Tabor; to the Palamitic view of which the Throne of Constantinople allowed itself to be pledged. It is nominally so to this day; but we believe that, actually, the commemoration of Gregory is, except in some few places, forbidden.

The documents are sometimes decisions of the Patriarchal Council (signed by from ten to thirty metropolitans and bishops), sometimes of the Patriarch alone; sometimes ecclesiastical edicts of the Emperor, sometimes professions of faith. The decisions are both in public and private matters; the latter usually concerns wills, marriages, or adoptions.

The names of many of these Prelates were unknown before: and we may notice a point connected with them. Our own first duty—as it would be that of every student of the Eastern Church—was to enter the names of the various Bishops who at different times formed the Byzantine Synod, and which occur there only, into our copy of Lequien. While, of course, these filled a great many vacancies in his noble work, they never convicted him of error, except in one solitary instance; and even in that we can see a very possible explanation. To those who know the character of Lequien's book, and the nature

of such synodical signatures, this proof of accuracy will, if possible, raise even higher than it stands at present the reputation of the great scholar of Boulogne: the rather that he had not lived to make his last corrections.

The Greek is sometimes very singular, and shows the deep decadence of the language. Thus, in 1315, a certain monk, Joannicius, after having been condemned for some crime, promises never again to celebrate, in the following words—a copy exactly (it is the fifteenth document).

† Ἐγὼ μοναχὸς Ἰωαννίκιος ὑπόσχομαι διὰ τῆς παρούσης μου ἐγγράφου ἀσφάλιας, ἐπεὶ ἐπραξάμην ἀνόσιον ἔργον καὶ ἀφηρίθην τὴν ἱεροσύνην μου, ἀπὸ τοῦδε κε εἰς τὸ ἕξῃς οὐ μὴ γυρεύσω, ἵνα καὶ πάλιν ἱερουργήσω. Εἰ δέ ποτε φοραθὼ εἰς τοῦτο τὴν ἐμφάνειαν τῆς παρούσης μου ἐγγράφου ἀσφάλιαν, ἵνα εἰμὶ ὑπεύθυνος τι δικαία κρίσις τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο κε τὴν παρούσαν μου ἐγγράφον ἀσφάλιαν πεποίηκα.

Poor Joannicius! it is almost too hard a measure to be so pilloried half a millennium after he has rested well in some Thracian or Asiatic church, probably now a mosque!

Then, again: we have many and many such a melancholy notification as No. xvii., which appears to bear date 1316, and where the Bishop of Sinope is made Prelate of the churches of Side, Sylæum and Leontopolis, long widowed through the devastation of the barbarians. And xviii., where the Bishop of Zaleucus is set over the Church of Amasea. All these examples, while remarkably resembling the state, contrast as remarkably with the proceedings, of the Roman Church, 900 years previously. Then, in like manner, her outlying dependencies were overrun with barbarians; but instead of agglomerating titles of distant extinct sees on one non-resident Bishop, she sent out her vigorous missionaries to fight Satan on his own ground; and they were victorious. Her bishoprics came back to her with new young life, with new fresh language. The winning back conquered provinces is her point of triumph over her Eastern Sisters; the retaining what she had once, in her new endeavours, won, is her Eastern Sisters' glory over her.

What would the Privy Council say, if, instead of the Westerton and Liddell case, it had to pronounce judgment on the following?

There was at Lacedæmon, in April, 1316, a lady named Euphrosyne Marina, who, having embraced the religious life, had the half property of an image of the Virgin the Hodegetria; the other moiety was vested in the Bishop of Cernitza, Malotaras. Of these, it seems, one wished to place the icon in one church, one in another. The matter made a great stir in those parts, and very great men interfered. No less a person than Kyr Andronicus Palæologus, the governor of

Peloponnesus, tried what he could do; so did the venerable Kyr Manuel Stephanites; so did the venerable Kyr the Kalodikes, and others more. But the more they tried, the worse they sped. So the case came before the synod. There were John XIII., the Metropolitans of Heraclea, Sardis, Nicomedia, Nicæa, Chalcedon, Monembasia, Pontoheracleia, Prusa, Pergamos, Christopolis, Dyrrachium, Bizya, Kius, Media. The lady, as usual, had her own way.

One wonders only how the ordinary diocesan business of such of these sees as were not in *partibus infidelium* could have been carried on, with the continual interruption of such general proceedings.

Again: there are several investigations connected with the heresy of the Bogomili. A history of this sect, the Albigenses of the East, has yet to be written; and when it is, the present diplomata will afford a good deal of interesting matter. In June, 1316, one Carianus, a priest, comes before the synod. He seems to have been a thoroughly *mauvais sujet*. Not prospering in his profession, he tendered his services, for a consideration, to the Patarenes. They offered, and he accepted—the terms might puzzle a merely classical student—*ὑπέρπυρα πενήκοντα καὶ ἄλογον* i.e. *fifty gold pieces* (worth about thirty shillings each) *and a horse*.¹ Having apparently got all he could obtain from this sect, he laid his hands on a drinking-cup, a spoon (*χουλιάριον*—the French *cuiller*), and their code² of laws, or of belief, which he hid in his hat. After various adventures, this worthy reached Constantinople, and was fortunate enough to get absolved.

A curious insight is obtained through these papers into the abuse which, in the East as in the West (though not to the same extent), encouraged the exemption of monasteries from Diocesan authority, and their immediate subjection to the Œcumenical throne. Thus, in October, 1318, we find the Metropolitan of Prusa invested with a kind of legantine authority to visit the province of Amasæa, and especially the 'patriarchal' Monastery of Agaura therein situated. In the same year, the Bishop of Larissa claims diocesan rights over the Monastery of Marmarianæ. The Archimandrite pleads patriarchal exemption; and the cause is decided in his favour. That exemption has always been held singularly dear: witness

¹ *ἵππος ἐστὶ τὸ ἄλογον, ὑπὲρ οἱ καβαλλάρου* says a MS. lexicon, under Schedographia.

² So we understand *μαγάρισμος*, though the expression is anything but clear. The word originally meant apostasy to the Agarenes (Mahometans); then, any kind of apostasy (and so it is often used of Iconoclasm); and then, the proof or sign of apostasy.

the endeavours of the larger French monasteries, in the seventh and eighth and ninth centuries, to be declared 'royal,' *i.e.* responsible, not to the Bishop, but to the 'Arch-chaplain' ¹ of the palace.

Then, again, we have singular catalogues of 'patriarchal possessions,' which seem to include churches to which the Patriarch had the right of presentation in various dioceses. About 1320, in the comparatively small island of Lemnos there are no less than twenty-five! What must have been the enormous wealth of Constantinople in the height of its worldly glory!

Further, we have the method by which a Bishopric was converted into a Metropolis. Thus, in 1323, the Emperor, Andronicus the Elder, wished thus to elevate Bysis. First we have the imperial document, δι' ἐρυθρῶν γραμμάτων; then its confirmation by Isaiah: to the latter document is sometimes, in the like cases, added a similar confirmation by the Synod.

In 1325 we have a singular trial, again connected with the Bogomili. One Dorotheus, from the Monastery of CHRIST the Philocalus in Thessalonica, was subject to epileptic fits, and had tried the then resources of physic to little purpose. He next betook himself to the heresy which was so prevalent in those parts; and he was taught by its professors, εἴπερ ἀπαλλαγὴν ἐθέλοι τοῦ συνέχοντος πάθους εὐρεῖν, μίαναι τὸ τῶν ἁγίων θεοφανίων ἁγίασμα καὶ ἐκ τούτου πιεῖν καὶ τοῖς τούτου λόγοις παρασυρεῖς καὶ τὴν γνώμην ματαιωθεὶς ἐτόλμησε τὴν τοιαύτην μυσαρὰν πράξιν, μή τις λαβόντος αἰσθῆσιν τῶν ἐν τῇ μονῇ. The poor man died; but the question was, what should be done to one of his fellows, who had been made acquainted with the sacrilege and had not revealed it? The Synod suspend him for six months.

The Metropolitan of Philippi is accused of immorality, in July, 1337, under John XIV. (Calecas). Certainly, the quaint fashion in which the depositions of the ecclesiastics are given is worth quoting. One example may serve for all:—

'Εγὼ ὁ ἱερομόναχος Γρηγόριος λέγω· εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ ὢν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· οὐ ψεύδομαι, καὶ ὁμνῶ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγέλια, ὅτι εἶδον τὴν Πετραλοφίαν εἰσαγομένην κατὰ πρῶτον ὕπνον παρὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ μητροπολίτου, τοῦ Ἀλβανίτου Μιχαὴλ, διὰ τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ μοναστηρίου εἰς τὸ κέλλιον τοῦ μητροπολίτου, ἀνδρῶν φοροῦσαν ἐνδύματα, καὶ πάλιν ἐξιοῦσαν μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀλβανίτου κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ὄρθρου, ὡσαύτως ἐβλεπον αὐτὴν καὶ κατὰ διαφόρους ἡμέρας εἰσέρχομένην καὶ ἐξέρχομένην φανερώς.

¹ No better account can be given of these attempts than that which is to be found in the Abbé Piolin's *Histoire de l'Eglise du Mans*, and especially in his biography of S. Aldric, in the second volume. Such a book we may vainly look for as regards the Churches of England. We have no wish to speak with disrespect of Dr. Hook's work; but—the marvellous difference!

Τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ μητροπολίτου! And so, all the 'super-illustriousness' usually attached to the lowest Bishop is dropped, and the defendant, prelate of a great Church, simply becomes 'the man, the Metropolitan.'

The next document, July, 1339, introduces us to a new branch of the Eastern Church. John XIV. replies to the Metropolitan of Russia, thus:—

'Most holy Metropolitan of Rhosia, and most excellent: in the HOLY GHOST beloved brother of our meanness, and sylliturgist. Grace and peace from GOD be with thy Holiness. We have received an epistle from thy Holiness, entering into details, and giving a complete account concerning thy predecessor in the same most holy Church; how since his death he hath been glorified by GOD, and manifested to be His true servant, insomuch that mighty wonders have been wrought by him, and cures of all kinds performed. We are glad, and rejoice spiritually on this account, and have offered to GOD the praise. But since thy Holiness also desireth to learn from us what ought to be done with these holy relics, thyself well knowest, how it is a part of the order and custom of Holy Church, when full and indubitable proof of such a matter has been produced, to act. Thou wilt honour and glorify with hymns and doxologies the servant of GOD,—and for all future time celebrate his memory to the praise of the GOD Who glorifieth those that glorify Him: Whose grace be with thy Holiness.—July: Indict. ζ †.'

The deceased Metropolitan was S. Peter; the correspondent of the Patriarch was Theognostes, a Greek by birth.

There is a really lovely letter (xcii.), undated, addressed by the same John XIV. to the inhabitants of Nicæa, now in the power of the Mahometans, and exhorting them to stand fast in the faith:—*εἰ γὰρ καὶ κυριεύουσιν ὑμῶν οἱ ἐχθροί, ἀλλὰ τῶν οἰκειῶν ψυχῶν καὶ τῆς γνώμης αὐτοὶ ἑαυτῶν ἐστὲ κύριοι.* It is the only communication of the kind in the volume.

We have (p. 263) some very singular epistles from John Cantacuzene to the Metropolitan of Kieff, and to Demetrius Ljubat, Prince of Vladimir, which show how completely the Byzantine Emperor felt himself entitled to make ecclesiastical changes in Russia. This proves that Mouravieff's history of that period must be received with some degree of caution.

In consequence of the controversy on the Uncreated Light, several of the condemned party took refuge in the Latin Church. Some of them returned from it: the recantation of one Philip Lomelini is worth quoting, from the oddity of the Greek—evidently written by ear.

† Πιστεύω ἰς ἓνα θεόν, κ. τ. λ. 'Εποὶ δὲ νύπισ φανιστοῖς προσεμύνα τοὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Λατίνων καὶ ὑπὸ πλάνοις καὶ ἀπάτοις καὶ ἀγνωσίας ἐνομιζόν ὀρθὰ ὕνε πρὸς τὴν εὐσεβίᾳ καὶ ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστιν πάντα, ὅσα ἐν ἐκείνῳ λέγεται περὶ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἴσα ἐν ἐκείνῳ τελλοῦντε, ἐπὶ οὐ ὑπὸ ἀγνωσίας ἔσπεργον ἔκονα, νῦν ἀποβάλλομε καὶ ἀρνούμε πάντα, ὡς κακοδόξα καὶ ἐρετικῶν ἔργα τε καὶ φρονήματα, προσερχόμε δὲ καθαρῶς καὶ γνισίως ὑς τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ὁμολογῶ κατὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ κυρίου

καὶ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ὑμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου συμβόλου τὸ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἀποβάλλομε καὶ ἀρνοῦμε καὶ πάντα τὰ λυπὰ ἐκείνων ἔθιμα, τὰ τε ἐκκλησιαστικά καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῖς λυπῖς αὐτῶν πολυτίας, στέργω δέ, ἅπερ ἰ ἀγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθολικοὶ καὶ ἀποστολικοὶ ἐκκλησία φρονί καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἵς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν καὶ μαθητοῖς τοῖς ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἰς τὴν περὶ τούτων ἀσφάλαν ἐπιούσαν μοι τὴν παρούσαν μου ὁμολογίαν, ὑπογράψας αὐτὴν οἰκοχίρως, μηνὶ ἰουνίῳ, α', ἰνδ. η' †.

† Ἐγὼ ὁ Φίλλειππος Λομεληνός †.

These are some of the more interesting parts of this work. That of MM. Rallé and Potle we hope to consider more at length on some future occasion; and will not enter into a book of so much importance at the end of an article.

We will now return to Professor Stanley. The last part of his work is on Russia:—and though rather 'got up,' it is interesting, and on the whole correct. The first lecture is on the Early Church of Muscovy. He quotes, as 'the genuine portraiture of a Russian Christian of early days,' the testament of Vladimir Monomachus, who married the daughter of our Harold.

"If you find yourself affected by any ailment, make three prostrations to the ground before the Lord; and never let the sun find you in bed. At the dawn of day, my father, and the virtuous men by whom he was surrounded, did thus: they glorified the Lord, and cried, in the joy of their hearts, 'Vouchsafe, O my God, to enlighten me with thy divine light.' They then seated themselves to deliberate, or to administer justice to the people, or they went to the chase; and in the middle of the day they slept; which God permits to man as well as to beasts and birds.

"For my part, I accustomed myself to do everything that I might have ordered my servants to do. Night and day, summer and winter, I was perpetually moving about. I wished to see everything with my own eyes. Never did I abandon the poor or the widow to the oppressions of the powerful. I made it my duty to inspect the churches and the sacred ceremonies of religion, as well as the management of my property, my stables, and the vultures and hawks of my hunting establishment.

"I have made eighty-three campaigns and many expeditions. I concluded nineteen treaties with the Poloctzy. I took captive one hundred of their princes, whom I set free again; and I put two hundred of them to death, by throwing them into rivers.

"No one has ever travelled more rapidly than I have done. Setting out in the morning from Tchernigof, I have arrived at Kieff before the hour of vespers.

"In my youth, what falls from my horse did I not experience! wounding my feet and my hands, and breaking my head against trees. But the Lord watched over me.

"In hunting amidst the thickest forests, how many times have I myself caught wild horses and bound them together! How many times have I been thrown down by buffaloes, wounded by the antlers of stags, and trodden under the feet of elks! A furious wild boar rent my sword from my baldric: my saddle was torn to pieces by a bear; this terrible beast rushed upon my courser, whom he threw down upon me. But the Lord protected me.

"O, my children, fear neither death nor wild beasts. Trust in Providence: it far surpasses all human precautions."

The second lecture is on the Russian Church of the Middle Ages. The third on the Great Patriarch Nikon; and the fourth on the Dissenters or Rascolniks. (*Rascolot*, to split; *rascol*, schism; *rascolnik*, schismatic.) The author of 'Le Raskol' gives a fair account of these people, who take their rise from the reformation introduced by Nikon in the seventeenth century.

'Le schisme s'était partagé tout d'abord en deux branches bien distinctes et qui en forment jusqu'à présent les deux divisions principales: les Popovtzi, secte qui reconnaît l'autorité d'un clergé, et les Bezpopovtzi, c'est-à-dire ceux qui n'ont point de prêtres. Les Popovtzi, conservant quelques idées d'ordre et d'organisation, veulent que leur religion ait ses ministres; ils croient avec raison qu'une Église sans prêtres n'est pas une Église. Aussi, après la réforme de Nikon, conservèrent-ils d'anciens popes, qui avaient reçu l'onction d'évêques exiles. Puis la nécessité les poussa à admettre les prêtres de l'Église officielle que des motifs divers chassaient de leurs diocèses. Ils ne les recevaient toutefois qu'après une certaine purification conforme à leurs idées, après des prières expiatoires, et un acte plus significatif, consistant à cracher, en signe de mépris, sur l'Église dont ils faisaient jadis partie. Plus tard les Popovtzi, simplifiant le mode d'intronisation de leurs ministres, acclamèrent le premier venu qui sut mériter leur sympathie en se pliant à leurs exigences.

'Les Bezpopovtzi, comme leur nom l'indique, n'ont pas de clergé; ils soutiennent que, puisque Dieu n'a pas permis à des évêques de faire partie de leur Église, ils ne sauraient avoir de prêtres; ceux-ci n'ayant de qui tenir leur pouvoir.

'Les vieillards les plus vertueux doivent leur lire les Saintes-Écritures. C'est à ces formes élémentaires que leur sacerdoce est ordinairement ramené. Quelquefois, dans cette secte, hommes et femmes s'enferment dans des chapelles et y attendent au milieu de l'obscurité et du silence qu'un prêtre leur soit révélé par le ciel. Ils s'abstiennent de la communion, font baptiser leurs enfants par les sages-femmes, se marient et divorcent à volonté. La base du mariage, disent-ils, étant l'accord des fiancés, et l'amour, dont la nature est divine, devant régler la durée de l'union des cœurs, il en résulte naturellement que les liens conjugaux doivent cesser du libre consentement des époux et quand l'amour a disparu.

'Ces deux branches principales du Raskol, les Popovtzi et les Bezpopovtzi, se subdivisèrent en une foule de rameaux secondaires.

'Le premier, parmi les Popovtzi, qui fit secte à part, fut Abbacume; puis vient Onoufri, fondateur de la secte appelée Onoufrievstchina; Étienne donna son nom aux Stéphaniens, etc.—

'Dans la secte des Bezpopovtzi, l'union de Théodose, l'union de Philippe, etc., formèrent des divisions sur lesquelles on peut trouver des détails intéressants dans des ouvrages bien connus.—*Le Raskol*, pp. 14—16.

Professor Stanley gives an interesting account of a service of the Bezpopoffchins.

'The approaches of their milder brethren to the Establishment they regard, naturally, as a base compromise with Babylon. In many respects, the ritual of the two sects is the same. In both buildings alike we see the same gigantic faces, the same antique forms. But, unlike the chapel of the Popoffchins, or any church of the Establishment, the screen on which these pictures hang, the *iconostasis*, is not a partition opening into a sanctuary beyond, but is the abrupt and undisguised termination of the church itself.

You advance, thinking to pass, as in the ordinary churches, through the painted screen to the altar, and you find that you are stopped by a dead wall. In front of this wall—this screen which is not a screen (so let me describe the service which I there witnessed, on the eve of the anniversary of the Coronation)—an aged layman, with a long sectarian beard, chanted in a cracked voice such fragments of the service as are usually performed by the deacon; and from the body of the church a few scattered worshippers (their scantiness probably occasioned by the refusal of the sect to recognise the great State festival) screamed out the responses, bowing the head and signing the cross in their peculiar way as distinctly as so slight a difference will permit. That scanty congregation, venerable from their very eccentricity, that worship in the dim light of the truncated church, before the vacant wall which must constantly remind them of the loss of the very part of the ceremonial which they consider most essential, is the most signal of all triumphs of the letter that kills over the spirit that quickens; a truly Judaic faith, united with a truly Judaic narrowness, such as no Western nation could hope to produce. It shows us the legitimate conclusion of those who insist on turning either forms, or the rejection of forms, into principles, and on carrying out principles so engendered to their full length.

‘That the Russian Church, containing elements such as these, should have survived at all the shock of Peter’s revolution, is a proof of no slight vitality. But, after the first convulsion was over, it became apparent that (taking them as a whole) the religious feelings and the religious institutions of the country had embraced the change, and moved along with it. Many of the clergy did for a time make a stiff resistance; the unfortunate Alexis fell a victim to his intimacy with some of the disaffected Bishops; the Old Believers broke out into open rebellion; one of them attempted Peter’s life; some thousands of them, in the reign of the Empress Anne, intrenched themselves in the convent fortress of Solovetzky, and died, fighting to the last gasp, like the remnant of the Jewish people in the war of independence.’—*Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, pp. 482, 483.

We are bound to say, however, that Professor Stanley underestimates the importance of Nikon’s reforms; representing them as almost simply ritual. In truth, the text of the Slavonic Liturgy was horribly corrupt. A copy of the Rascolnik *Sloujebnek* lies before us as we write. It is a very handsome edition, got up, we are informed, by Government for the use of these poor people; and with a truly Apostolic forbearance, the Holy Greek Synod has, of late, permitted an Orthodox Priest to officiate according to it. Of course, only the Popoffchins will avail themselves of his services. But the book might be thus represented in English, if we may take a passage from our own Prayer-Book.

Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture proveth¹ us in sundrie² places to knowledge³ and confess our manifold sins and wickedness: and that we should not assemble⁴ nor cloke them before the face of Almighty God our heavenly Fadyr:⁵ but confess them, &c.

¹ moveth. ² sundry.

³ acknowledge.

⁴ dissemble.

⁵ Father.

At the end of the Professor's volume we have a very good plan of the Uspensky Cathedral, in Moscow—the Mount Athos of Russian devotion; built by Aristotle of Bologna, 1475—1479, and crowded with the tombs of the sainted prelates of Moscow. There is also a map of the Eastern Church, tinted according to its different branches.

We now take an unwilling leave of a very interesting work. Here and there, as was natural, the Professor allows his own views to crop out, but, with the exception of the amusing parallels to Messrs. Mansell and Jowett, nowhere offensively. If the Lectures do not exhibit, neither do they pretend to, a very deep acquaintance with the Eastern Church; and probably they are all the more popular, and so all the more useful, on that very account; while the interest of the word-painting they contain is not inferior to the other writings of the accomplished author of 'Sinai and Palestine.'

P.S. *The SHORTER NOTICES of the Books of the Quarter are postponed,
by the illness of the Editor.*

6, PATERNOSTER ROW,
26th June, 1861.